

the bill (H. R. 6287) to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954— AMENDMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9366) to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program, increase the benefits payable thereunder, preserve the insurance rights of disabled individuals, and increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

INCREASE OF BORROWING POWER OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9756) to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:
One hundred and two postmasters.

RECESS TO 10 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Saturday, August 14, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

SENATE

SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 5, 1954)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Be to us, O God, the guiding light of this day that, with wisdom and insight, we may be able to competently match its responsibilities. May our faith look up to Thee, our hearts put their trust in Thee, and our souls be flooded with the power of Thy presence.

Give unto us, we beseech Thee, the motive of the day: a complete willingness to serve Thee as we seek the best

ends for our fellow men. Let us be radiant diffusers of confidence by every act and service we perform that, in these days of insecurity, men may see our faith in Him who does not change. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 13, 1954, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been designated as one of the representatives of this Government to attend the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union which are to take place in Vienna from the 27th of August to the 2d of September. I have been requested by the Secretary of State to look into several matters which he desires investigated in Europe before the meeting. I ask unanimous consent that after Monday next I may be excused from attendance at the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, ISLE ROYALE NATIONAL PARK, MICH.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit to operate the Windigo Inn at Washington Harbor, Isle Royale National Park, Mich. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAW ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a law enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., to fix the regular expenses for the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law,

copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL REPORT OF MILITARY CHAPLAINS ASSOCIATION

A letter from the secretary-treasurer, the Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial report of that association for the period January 1, 1953, to December 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT ON ALASKA ROAD COMMISSION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Alaska Road Commission, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON PUERTO RICO RECONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS ENTITLED "PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESS IN MILITARY PROCUREMENT" (S. REPT. NO. 2487)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, from the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report entitled "Participation of Small Business in Military Procurement," and ask that it be printed, with illustrations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and without objection, will be printed as requested by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Military Procurement Subcommittee of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, I have submitted a report entitled "Participation of Small Business in Military Procurement" of the activities of the subcommittee, and ask that it be printed with illustrations.

The report outlines the activities of the subcommittee, and is based on a series of open hearings conducted during April and May of this year. I believe it is a constructive report, which will be helpful to small-business men and to Federal agencies in the development of an effective small-business program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a committee release summarizing the report be printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the importance and value of small-business enterprises in our Nation can hardly be overestimated. There are more than 4 million small-business establishments in the United States and this is 96 percent of all the business in the Nation. There are well over 100,000 small-business establishments in Michigan alone.

The United States Senate recognized the importance of small businesses in our national economy with the establishment of the Small Business Committee in 1950. I am proud to have voted to establish a strong, continuing committee at that time.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business has made many constructive contributions through its reports, such as the one I have filed in the Senate today, its hearings and recommendations.

During my 2 years on the committee, I have served as chairman of the Military Procurement Subcommittee, and I believe we have made significant progress in assuring small-business concerns an equitable share of Government contracts.

I have also been privileged to serve as a member of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Small Business Committee. Last year, before the American Bar Association, I outlined my concept of the role of American antitrust laws in this way:

Small- and medium-size businessmen of our country are the backbone of our economy. They must always be protected against the predatory practices of those larger competitors who may seek to take unfair advantage of their greater wealth. Most small-business men do not ask, and do not expect, crutches for their economic support or protection against competition, which is not unfair. But they are entitled to expect the protection of the laws that insure their right to engage in a fair competitive contest for the patronage of the consumer, that insure their right to grow and to prosper, and that insure their right to expand by their industry and hard work in an economy free of unreasonable restraints. These are the basic purposes of our antitrust laws.

Our Monopoly Subcommittee has been in agreement that bigness in itself is no crime, but that unfair or predatory competitive practices are bad and must be prosecuted wherever found. In the fields of distribution and retailing where the business units are usually very small and less able to protect themselves against unfair business practices, our subcommittee has been particularly active. Service in this area has been particularly rewarding for me.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION

Over the past 20 years or so, the Federal Government has stepped into more and more business-type activities from which it can be dislodged only with great difficulty. Naturally, there are fields in which the Government must be active and even fields in which it might have to be preeminent. Nonetheless, our Government today is doing many things in direct competition with private businesses which are ready, willing, and able to perform those tasks and perform them at a lower cost, as well. A case in point

is the processing of metal scrap by the armed services. Last year the Small Business Committee highlighted the problem of the aluminum-sweating industry where the Navy and the Air Force had gotten a foothold through pilot or experimental operations, and appeared to be expanding into full-scale scrap processing, even though adequate civilian facilities were available. The committee recommended that expansions in this field cease. The Military Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, took appropriate action; the Senate approved; and there is now in the Defense Department Appropriations Act a proviso which definitely limits the authority of the armed services to enter into private business.

Government competition with private business covers a tremendous range of activities, and for many years I have been concerned about this growing problem. My work in this field led me to sponsor the legislation which last year resulted in the creation of a new Hoover Commission on Organization of the Federal Government.

This Commission, of which I am a member, is now engaged in a broad study of the activities of the Federal Government, and it has the specific power to recommend that the Government cease doing things which compete with private enterprise.

The Hoover Commission will make its report and recommendations early next year, and I am confident that it will point the way to great savings in the cost of government and a great reduction in the number of activities of the Government which compete with business.

TAXES AND GOVERNMENT SPENDING

As individuals, all of us are keenly aware of the taxes collected on every dollar we earn. Businessmen are even more conscious of that tax take, since every business decision is directly influenced by the large percentage of earnings which must be paid to the tax collector, rather than ploughed back into the business for new capacity or more efficient equipment.

I have always favored two approaches to minimizing the impact of Federal taxes on the individual and the small business enterprise: first, by reducing Government spending, and thus reducing taxes; second, by reducing the impact of taxes, by means of more equitable tax laws.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee for the past 12 years, I have consistently worked to eliminate all but the most essential Government spending. This has been a constant and difficult battle for many years, but the effort bore real fruit in the last 2 years. Last year, Congress and the administration reduced spending by \$11 billion under the level planned by the previous national administration. Still further reductions are being achieved this year.

These reductions in spending made possible, in turn, this year's tax cuts, which are the largest in history. More than \$4,700,000,000 has been eliminated from the tax bill of individual Americans. This is two-thirds of the total tax cut achieved this year. The remainder

of the reduction has gone to remove tax inequities, to permit greater expansion of business enterprises, and to create new jobs and business opportunity.

Many of the tax reductions, such as the cut in income taxes and the lowered excise tax, have already stimulated business to a great degree.

Another major accomplishment of this year is the general tax revision bill, the monumental overhaul of the entire tax structure of the Nation for the first time in 75 years. The bill eliminates many loopholes and inequities in our tax laws. It will be a real boon to small business firms, and I was proud to support its passage.

The tax revision bill is of specific benefit to small-business firms in connection with depreciation, accumulation of surpluses, research and experimental expenditures, loss carryover, treatment of partnerships, changes and capital structure, and other features.

Knowing at firsthand of the important results achieved by the Small Business Committee, I joined the other members of the committee in introducing Senate Resolution 213, which would create a permanent, standing Senate Committee on Small Business. Furthermore, in order to assure that the present Senate Small Business Committee has a continuity of membership, the Senate majority policy committee, of which I am chairman, approved a resolution calling attention to the value of the committee and urging that members of the committee be selected on the basis of experience on the committee and interest in its work.

Despite the effective work of the committee, many of us felt that the interests of small business also required the creation of a special agency of Government devoted to the interests of small business. The Small Defense Plants Administration, established in 1951, was a step in the right direction. However, it did not completely fill the bill.

Congress last year recognized the importance of the matter, and for the first time voted to establish a separate, independent agency to assist small business in a truly constructive way. I am proud of my vote to set up this agency. President Eisenhower signed the measure into law the very day it was passed by Congress.

The Small Business Administration is the first comprehensive, peacetime, independent, governmental agency in history created for the sole purpose of advising, counseling, and assisting small business enterprises.

Each of the agency's three main programs—loans and financial counseling assistance, aid in getting Government contracts, and technical and managerial help of many kinds—is designed to offer important services to help all small firms.

In all three fields the results so far are notable, and they offer even greater promise for future development.

Summing up the year's accomplishments in the three major fields of activity, here is the Small Business Administration's record for the State of Michigan and the Nation; and I refer to the results of the program in Mich-

igan as an example of what it can do and does do for the other States.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Authority for the Small Business Administration to make loans did not begin until September 29, 1953. Since then, 19 small business loans, totaling \$1,295,000, have been approved to assist firms in Michigan. Nationally, more than 530 loans have been approved, with a value exceeding \$31 million.

Approximately 75 loan applications have been received from small firms in Michigan; and 14 of these, totaling \$840,000, are pending final action by the Small Business Administration.

The Small Business Administration is working with the private banks, to help provide term credit to small firms. On a nationwide basis, two-thirds of the loans made by the Small Business Administration to help small firms are made in cooperation with private banks. In Michigan, about half of the loans so far made are bank-participation loans, and the remainder are direct loans. The Small Business Administration makes every effort to arrange a private or a participation loan, before approving a direct loan in which the Government advances all of the funds. The bank-participation loans are administered by the private banks, and the banks put up part of the money. This record indicates the desire of the banking community to assist business enterprise.

It is the objective of the Small Business Administration to help the proprietor of a small firm establish a banking relationship with a private bank in his own community. Thus, the Small Business Administration is providing a service of lasting value, helping to strengthen the customer-bank relationships in the local community.

PROCUREMENT ASSISTANCE

The law creating the Small Business Administration gives it the responsibility for seeing to it that a fair share of the goods and services purchased by the Government—and we should remember that the United States Government is the biggest customer in the world—are obtained from small firms.

The Small Business Administration has so far assisted 26 small firms in Michigan obtain \$2,074,774 in Government contracts.

These figures represent actual contract awards under the Small Business Administration's joint determination program, but they tell only a small part of the accomplishments of the Small Business Administration in helping Michigan firms get Government contracts.

The Small Business Administration concentrates its contract procurement assistance activity in the area where—except for the vigilance of the Small Business Administration and small-business specialists in other Government agencies—the contracts might go to larger firms. Through its joint determination program, it is constantly working to increase the small-business share of Government orders.

In addition, through cooperative programs, larger private firms are constantly being encouraged to place more of

their orders with smaller concerns in their own areas.

The Detroit office of the Small Business Administration, at 231 West Lafayette Boulevard, regularly receives notices of procurement opportunities. It also keeps a register of many hundreds of Michigan firms that are desirous of obtaining a Government contract.

Every day, procurement specialists in the Small Business Administration's offices in Detroit and Cleveland check the list of products the Government wants to buy, and refers them to Michigan firms that are capable of producing the specific products.

Last year the Detroit office of the Small Business Administration made more than 8,000 specific referrals of prime contract opportunities to firms in Michigan. Although it is impossible to keep a close check on the results of each referral, it is known that they resulted in a good volume of Government contracts going to small firms in Michigan.

The activities of the Small Business Administration help create jobs and payrolls in Michigan. Government purchases in the area cover a wide range of products from clothing and food to wrenches and machine tools.

In addition to helping small firms get direct Government contracts, the Small Business Administration also works with firms holding large prime Government contracts and helps them locate smaller firms who can take a subcontract. This activity is, of course, a two-way street.

The Small Business Administration not only helps the smaller firms by aiding them in getting more business, but also helps the larger producer develop reliable suppliers. The net result is to stimulate all business activity.

In the three-State region composed of Michigan, Ohio, and Kentucky, the Small Business Administration has made more than 2,500 referrals to help small firms obtain subcontracts from larger firms—and a large share of these referrals were made in Michigan.

MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Under this important program the Small Business Administration, through its field offices, offers a wide range of service to help small firms.

The Small Business Administration publishes two series of practical and helpful leaflets called Management and Technical Aids for Small Business. These leaflets cover a wide range of management and production problems, and are in great demand.

They are designed particularly to aid the proprietor of a small firm who may have an outstanding aptitude in certain lines, but lacks the rounded management experience which big companies hire for their top management team.

The Small Business Administration has recently developed a program of helping small firms with products-development problems—finding new uses and new applications for items produced by small firms.

There are hundreds of small firms in the State of Michigan whose proprietors have ideas for improved or new products and processes, or perhaps they own a product patent, but they may lack the

technical know-how or means of putting the article or new idea to practical use.

The Small Business Administration is giving help to these firms. Sometimes its experts can direct the proprietor to a competent research institution or laboratory, or refer an inventor to a firm which may utilize his invention or idea.

All of the programs of the Small Business Administration are aimed at this one basic objective: to assist in the growth and survival of small-business firms, to help them meet the continuing challenge of our expanding economy.

These are some of the things the Administration and the Congress are doing to help small firms find solutions to their problems, and to help maintain a healthy economy.

As chairman of the majority policy committee in the Senate, a responsibility for development of this broad program has fallen on my shoulders and I have worked closely with the House and Senate leaders and the Administration in the creation and passage of a program that means real progress for the Nation. I believe our accomplishments to date have been noteworthy. They hold real promise for the future.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, who is chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business.

Mr. THYE. I rise to commend the Senator from Michigan for his able address outlining what has been attempted and what has been accomplished. The Senator from Michigan has been an able chairman of a subcommittee which has done a great deal of work in aiding business and in seeking to maintain the healthy, progressive growth of the small businesses of America.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the chairman of the select committee, who has been of great assistance, and who performs his duties as chairman with great ability and effect because he believes in small business. The business activities in his State and mine, and, in fact, in all the States, are predominantly carried on by small-business concerns. Some may think of Michigan as being a State where only big business is found, but when one figures that there are 100,000 small businesses there, compared to 5, 6, or 10 big businesses, as in the Senator's State, we appreciate the importance of small business.

Mr. THYE. Our main streets are lined with the concerns operated by small-business men.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. They are the backbone of the Nation. The others are incidental.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is correct.

EXHIBIT 1

SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE SUMMARY

"Progress is being made" in assuring the Nation's small-business men an adequate share of Government procurement orders, the Senate Small Business Committee said today in a report submitted to the Senate by Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, chairman of the group's Military Procurement Subcommittee. Senator EDWARD J. THYE, Republican, of Minnesota, is chairman of the full committee.

The committee report also: Recognized the efforts being made by the armed services in working out an effective subcontracting program through their large prime contractors. Called for a more exerted effort to bring the small-business firms into the area of research and development. Showed that small-business programs worked out by the civilian agencies are proving helpful to small business.

The report resulted from a series of public hearings conducted by the committee during March and April. "The hearings reviewed the progress and problems of the various Government agencies in carrying out the small-business policies established by Congress," Senators THYE and FERGUSON said.

Small-business men, representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, General Accounting Office, Veterans' Administration, Foreign Operations Administration, and the Atomic Energy Commission, testified before the Ferguson subcommittee.

The report reflected the committee's findings that effective progress has been made in the small-business programs of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Small-business firms received 40.7 percent of the total dollar volume of prime contracts awarded by the Army in the first 6 months of fiscal 1954. Navy awards of prime contracts to small business for the same period amounted to 19.5 percent. The Air Force percentage was 7.1.

Within the area of what the military services consider to be suitable for award to small business, the Army awarded 69 percent of its prime contracts to small firms; the Navy, 85.2 percent; and the Air Force, 78 percent. These figures represent an increase in contracts awarded to small business over previous years, according to the report.

The report recommended that the military services discontinue the use of the terms "suitability" and "suitable" in calculating statistics to show the percentage of prime contracts going to small-business firms. The committee stated that the use of such terms could cause confusion and could be construed to mean that the military agencies were attempting to decide what small firms could produce and what they could not produce. The report points out that small business can bid on any article and that the term is used for compiling statistics only. The committee suggested the use of the term "potential" in future statistical calculations.

The report was critical of delays in contract administration, abuse of authority to negotiate contracts, and the practice of accelerated year-end buying.

The committee found that administrative delays constituted a real problem for the small concern. The committee cited as an example a 3-month delay by the Corps of Engineers in submitting a report to the Comptroller General in a procurement of tractors and scrapers. By the time the Comptroller General received the report and made a decision that the award was "illegal," 90 percent of the equipment had been delivered. In its report, the committee stated: "It is this type of delay which makes doing business with the Government difficult and, in many cases, unrewarding, to say the least."

The committee pointed to testimony from General Accounting Office officials that at least 90 percent of military contracts are negotiated and expressed the view that emergency powers to negotiate contracts are being abused. The report points out that Congress by law has stated that formal advertising should be the basic method of procurement and that negotiation is to be used only under certain specific exceptions spelled out in the law.

The report indicates committee concern about the practice of military agencies to make heavy purchases at the end of a fiscal year in an effort to commit funds. This practice drew sharp criticism from the General Accounting Office. Poor procurement

and a waste of public funds are given by the Senate Committee as two results of this practice.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on a matter of personal privilege.

On August 5 a newspaper in North Dakota known as the Fargo Forum carried on the front page an article under a headline "Ike Names Robert Vogel, Tenborg to Federal Jobs."

I call attention to the fact that the article apparently did not come from the Associated Press, the United Press, the International News Service, or any newspaper organization. The story goes over to page 2, column 3, and it states the following:

Earlier Wednesday William P. Rogers, Deputy Attorney General, told a reporter there is no truth to reports that Senator LANGER has been "sandbagging" the administration by holding up action on other nominations in an attempt to force approval of his choices for Federal posts in North Dakota.

LANGER also denied, in a separate interview, that he had held up action on nominations for other areas.

Rogers declared: "Senator LANGER has never held up nominations in his committee for other than necessary reasons and has not done so in order to use pressure on the administration. I would know if he had done so."

"Actually, the committee has had to pass upon the largest number of nominations in any similar period of time. And not one has had a later adverse vote in the Senate."

That is the end of the quotation. The article then continues:

Despite these statements, however, it is known some Senators feel LANGER has unnecessarily sidetracked, temporarily at least, nominations affecting their States.

Mr. President, when I was a candidate 2 years ago, practically every daily newspaper in the State opposed me. They began to make statements which were so false that I finally offered a prize of \$50 in an essay contest to determine which of these newspapers was the biggest liar in the State of North Dakota. The prize went to the Bismarck Tribune. The Fargo Forum, which published the statement on August 5 to which I have called attention, was a close second. I thought the Bismarck Tribune was entitled to first place because when a national magazine had a vote of reporters as to which was the worst Senator in the United States Senate and listed the first 6, and in that list the late Senator Taft was fifth, and the senior Senator from North Dakota was sixth, the Bismarck Tribune, in an editorial left out Senator Taft's name intentionally, because they knew of the very fine standing the late Senator had among the people of North Dakota. By eliminating Taft's name, they endeavored to tear down the character of the Senator from North Dakota. It was apparent this newspaper intentionally and deliberately eliminated the name of the late Senator Taft, and therefore they secured the prize as the newspaper which lied the most in the State.

However, today I wish to show how contemptuous this newspaper, the Fargo

Forum, is and how deliberately it lies in an attempt to deceive the people of the State of North Dakota.

I read from the article:

Despite these statements, however, it is known some Senators feel LANGER has unnecessarily sidetracked, temporarily at least, nominations affecting their States.

I brand that as a lie, made out of whole cloth, and I charge that this newspaper continues in its attempt to tear down my character and reputation. Therefore I shall now give the record.

Every Senator knows that when a nomination involving a judicial office, namely, Federal judge, or United States attorney, or United States marshal, comes to the Senate from the President, the nomination goes to the Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am the chairman. Under the rules of the committee, a subcommittee is appointed and 7 days' notice of hearing must be given. Our committee meets on Mondays. Consequently, if a nomination is received on Tuesday, obviously, when 7-day notice is given, it means that at least 13 days must pass before the committee can take up the nomination. Not only that, but if there is no quorum present, as sometimes happens, another week goes by without action.

Our committee consists of 15 members, 8 Republicans and 7 Democrats, and sometimes Senators are away or ill, and sometimes they are engaged in other committee work. An examination of the record will show that on various occasions it is impossible to get a quorum.

However, I have in my hand the record of every State on every nomination that has come the Judiciary Committee during the time I have been its chairman.

I first take up Alabama. I will ask the two Senators from Alabama to listen closely.

There was referred to the Judiciary Committee by the President on the 18th day of April 1953 the nomination of Hartwell Davis to be United States Attorney. A hearing was held on the 30th of April. The full committee took action on the 4th of June. Some slight investigation was needed. However, certainly no one can claim—and I am sure the two Senators from Alabama will not claim—that there was any unnecessary delay.

The President sent us the nomination of James L. May to be United States marshal, and it came to the committee on June 24, 1953. A hearing was held on the 7th of July 1953, and the full committee took action on the 13th day of July 1953, within approximately 3 weeks. Certainly there was no unnecessary delay there.

The nomination of Pervie Lee Dodd to be United States marshal came to the Judiciary Committee on the 21st of July. A hearing was held on the 30th of July, and the full committee acted on the same day, the 30th of July. Certainly there was no delay there.

The nomination of Harlan H. Grooms to be the United States district judge came to the committee on the 23d of July 1953. A hearing was held on the nomination on the 30th of July 1953, and the committee took action on the nomina-

tion on the same day, the 30th of July. Certainly there was no delay there.

The nomination of Frank M. Johnson, Jr., to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on the 28th of July 1953. A hearing was held promptly. He had appeared before the full committee before. The committee took action on his nomination just 2 days later, on July 30, 1953.

The nomination of Charles S. Prescott to be United States marshal came to the committee on the 19th day of July 1954. A hearing was held on the 30th day of July 1954. The committee took action on the 5th day of August 1954. I call upon the Senators from Alabama to state if that action was not prompt, and whether there was any delay of any kind, and whether in all their experience nominations had been acted on more promptly.

I come now to the State of Arizona. The nomination of Edward W. Scruggs to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on March 11, 1953. The hearing was held on March 25, 1953. The committee took action on April 13, 1953. Certainly there was no delay there. I call upon the Senators from Arizona to state whether there was any delay, not only on this nomination, but on the other three I shall name.

The nomination of Jack D. H. Hays to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. A hearing was held on February 17, 1954, and the full committee took action on February 24, 1954. Certainly there was no delay there.

The nomination of Archie M. Meyer came to the committee on the 24th day of February 1954. A hearing was held on March 12, 1954, and the full committee took action on March 29, 1954. Certainly there was no delay there.

The nomination of Richard H. Chambers to be United States circuit judge came to the committee on April 6, 1954. A hearing was held on April 22, 1954. The committee took action on April 26, 1954. Certainly there was no delay there.

We come next to the State of Arkansas. The nomination of Charles W. Atkinson to be United States attorney came to the committee on June 24, 1953. A hearing was held on July 7, 1953, and the full committee took action on July 13, 1953. Action on that nomination was taken 1 week after the hearing on it.

The nomination of Osro Cobb by the President came to the committee on the 11th of January. A complaint had been filed in the matter, and a hearing was held on the 16th of February. The full committee took action on the nomination on the 24th of February 1954.

The nomination of Cooper Hudsteth to be United States marshal came to the committee on January 11, 1954. A hearing was held on the nomination on February 17, 1954, and the full committee took action on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of Richard B. Kidd to be United States marshal came to the committee on July 11, 1953. A hearing was held on July 21, 1953. The full committee took action on July 27, 1953.

We come now to the State of California. The nomination of Warren Ol-

ney III to be Assistant Attorney General came to the committee on January 22, 1953. A hearing was held on January 28. By unanimous vote of the committee he was recommended for confirmation on the 28th day of January 1953. Certainly there was no delay there.

The nomination of Robert W. Ware to be United States marshal came to the committee on March 11, 1954. A hearing was held on the 25th of March. The committee took action on the 13th of April.

The nomination of Lloyd H. Burke to be United States attorney came to the committee on March 23, 1953. A hearing was held on April 2, 1953. The committee took action on the 13th day of April 1953.

The nomination of Stanley N. Barnes to be Assistant Attorney General was referred to the committee on the 1st of April 1953. A hearing was promptly held, and he was confirmed on April 13, 1953.

The nomination of Laughlin E. Waters to be United States attorney came to the committee on June 8, 1953. Hearing was held on July 2, 1953, and he was confirmed on the same day.

The nomination of Frank D. Bell to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on June 24, 1953. Hearing was held on July 7, 1953, and committee action was taken on July 13, 1953.

The nomination of James A. Johnston to be a member of the Parole Board was referred to the committee on July 23, 1953. Hearing was held on July 30, 1953, and he was confirmed on July 30, 1953, the same day.

The nomination of Oliber D. Hamlin, Jr., to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on July 23, 1953. Hearing was held on July 30, 1953, and he was confirmed on that same day.

The nomination of Earl Warren to be Chief Justice of the United States was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearings were held from February 2d to the 19th, 1954, and he was confirmed on February 24, 1954.

If either of the Senators from California has any objection, or has any statement to make to the effect that there was any delay in connection with the action taken by the Senator from North Dakota or that he made any effort to tie up any of these nominations, I should like to have him stand and so state.

There were some other nominations from California. The nomination of Dal M. Lemmon to be United States circuit judge was referred to the committee on April 6, 1954. Hearing was held on April 22, 1954, and the nomination was reported on April 26, 1954.

The nomination of Joseph M. Swing to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization was referred to the committee on April 28, 1954. Hearing was held on May 12, 1954, and the committee action was taken on May 17, 1954.

I come now to the State of Colorado. At any time any Senator wants to interrupt me to state that any of these nominations were held up for any ulti-

rior or any other purpose by the Senator from North Dakota, let him say so.

From Colorado there were only three nominations. The nomination of Donald E. Kelley to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearing was held on February 16, 1954, and the committee acted on March 29, 1954. In that case objections were filed by some citizens. I have had the active cooperation of every member of the committee. It has been the responsibility of the committee to see that when a man is nominated to be a Federal judge, which is a job for life, that a thorough investigation is made. That is the attitude of every member of the committee, Democrat or Republican. It has been the job of our committee to see to it that a thorough investigation is made, and any objection that is filed is heard, because there is no member of the committee who wants a man appointed for life who will not be a good judge.

We use equally good care in the matter of United States attorneys and United States marshals. The record shows, Mr. President, that so far, at least, in this administration, no one who has been confirmed has been charged by the Department of Justice with any action which involves the character or the honesty of the nominee. I have been a member of the Judiciary Committee for a long time, and I remember that 2 years ago, in spite of all the care we took, there was one United States marshal and there was one United States attorney removed for malfeasance or misdemeanors in office. That is less than 2 percent. That was in spite of the utmost care we took, particularly in the case of a United States marshal in California. The committee went most carefully into his qualifications.

There are two other nominations from Colorado. The nomination of Tom Kimball to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 27, 1954. Hearing was held on February 18, 1954, and the committee acted on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of J. S. Breitenstein to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on April 6, 1954. Hearing was held on April 15, 1954, and action was taken on April 22, 1954. Certainly there was no delay in that case. If there is any Senator from Colorado, now or at any future time before we adjourn, who will say that we held up any of those nominations, I shall be glad to have him stand up on the floor and say so.

Mr. President, I now come to Connecticut. The nomination of Simon S. Cohen to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on July 11, 1953. Hearing was held on July 21, 1953, and the nomination was reported on the same day.

The nomination of Andrew T. McGuire to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on August 3, 1953. Congress adjourned on that day, so that the committee could not take action.

The nomination of John A. Danaher to be a member of the United States Court

of Appeals for the District of Columbia was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearing was had on February 3, 1954, and committee action was taken on March 29, 1954. In that case there was an investigation which did not involve Mr. Danaher personally. He was confirmed on the 29th of March. Certainly there was no delay there, as Mr. Danaher himself will gladly testify in case he is asked, because he is thoroughly familiar with what occurred in that investigation.

The nomination of Carroll C. Hincks to be United States court of appeals judge for the second circuit came before the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearing was had on February 4, 1954, and action was taken on February 8, 1954.

The nomination of Robert P. Anderson to be district judge was referred to the committee on April 6, 1954. Hearing was had on April 15, 1954, and he was confirmed 1 week later, on April 22, 1954.

The nomination of Donald A. Fraser to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearing was had on February 17, 1954, and the nomination was reported on February 24, 1954.

I come now to the State of Delaware, and I issue the same invitation to the Senators from that State.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. LANGER. I prefer not to yield. After I have concluded I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee, because I am coming to the State of Tennessee in reading this record.

The nomination of Leonard H. Hagner to be United States attorney came to the committee on May 13, 1953. Hearing was held on May 20, 1953, and committee action was taken on June 4, 1953.

The nomination of Clarence H. Spence to be United States marshal came to the committee on May 28, 1953. Hearing was held on June 11, 1953, and committee action was taken on June 15, 1953.

I come now to the State of Florida. The nomination of George H. Carswell to be United States attorney came to the committee on May 28, 1953. Hearing was held on June 11, 1953, and the committee acted on June 29, 1953.

The nomination of James L. Guilmartin to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on May 28, 1953. Hearings were held on June 18 and 19, 1953, and the committee acted on July 30, 1953. Witnesses came from Florida, and the committee considered the matter time and time again and discussed it. The nomination was reported on the 30th day of July.

I think anyone who reads the volume of testimony taken in that case will say that the committee took exceedingly excellent precautions to make certain that the nomination was considered thoroughly in view of the large number of protests which were filed.

The nomination of Emerson F. Ridgeway to be United States marshal came to the committee on June 18, 1953. The hearing was held on July 7, 1953, and

the committee reported the nomination on July 27, 1953.

The nomination of Emmett C. Choate, to be United States district judge, was referred to the committee on June 22, 1954. The hearing was held on July 9, 1954, and the committee reported the nomination on July 19, 1954.

I issue the same invitation to the two Senators from Florida I have extended to other Senators. Let them come before the committee at any time, if they can show that there was any delay on the part of the senior Senator from North Dakota, or that he used any pressure at any time for ulterior purposes or any motives of his own. I shall be glad to have the Senators from Florida come upon the floor either today or before the Senate adjourns and so state.

I come now to the State of Georgia. The first nomination was of James W. Dorsey to be United States attorney. The nomination was referred to the committee on April 18, 1953. A hearing was held on April 30, 1953, and the nomination was reported on June 4, 1953.

The nomination of Frank O. Evans to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on May 15, 1953. A hearing was held on May 28, 1953, and the nomination was reported by the committee on June 4, 1953.

The nomination of William C. Calhoun to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on June 8, 1953. A hearing was held on July 2, 1953, and the committee reported the nomination on July 13, 1953.

The nomination of Billy Elza Carlisle to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on February 8, 1954. Hearing was held on February 19, 1954, and the nomination was reported on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of William A. Bootle to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on May 3, 1954. The committee hearing was held on May 12, 1954, and the nomination was reported on May 17, 1954.

The nomination of Elbert P. Tuttle to be a judge of the United States Court of Appeals was referred to the committee on July 7, 1954. A hearing was held on July 16, 1954, and the committee reported the nomination on August 3, 1954.

The nomination of William C. Littlefield came before the committee on August 6, 1953. As the distinguished Senators from Georgia will recall, the Senate adjourned before action could be taken on that nomination.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Georgia. If there was any delay on my part, as chairman of the committee, I certainly shall be glad to have the Senators from Georgia rise on the floor and say so. If they were not treated with every courtesy and were not allowed to come before the committee to state their objections, if they had any, or to state their endorsements, if they had any, I shall be happy to have them so state.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator from North Dakota will permit an interruption, I am pleased to say that all nomi-

nations of persons from the State of Georgia, for any office, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary were handled with very great promptness, to the satisfaction of all parties at interest.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

I come now to the State of Idaho. The first nomination was that of Sherman F. Furey to be United States attorney. The nomination was referred to the committee on April 18, 1953. A hearing was held on April 30, 1953, and the nomination was reported by the committee on May 4, 1953.

The nomination of Saul Hale Clark to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on May 1, 1953. A hearing was held on May 14, 1953, and the committee reported the nomination on May 18, 1953.

The nomination of Fred M. Taylor to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on July 9, 1954. The committee held a hearing on July 16, 1954, and the nomination was reported on July 19, 1954.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Idaho I have extended to other Senators.

I come now to Illinois. The nomination of John B. Stoddart, Jr., to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on March 11, 1953. A hearing was held on March 25, 1953, and the committee reported the nomination on April 27, 1953.

The nomination of William J. Littell to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on March 11, 1953. The committee held a hearing on March 25, 1953, and the committee reported the nomination on April 13, 1953.

The nomination of Clifford M. Raemer to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on March 30, 1953. The committee held a hearing on April 9, 1953, and the nomination was reported by the committee on April 13, 1953.

The nomination of Julius J. Hoffman to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on April 27, 1953. A hearing was held on May 6, 1953, and the committee reported the nomination April 11, 1953.

The nomination of Win G. Knoch to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on April 27, 1953. A hearing was held on May 6, 1953, and the nomination was reported on May 11, 1953.

The nomination of William W. Kipp, Sr., to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on June 18, 1953. A hearing was held on July 7, 1953, and the nomination was reported on July 13, 1953.

The nomination of Elmer Schnackenberg to be United States circuit judge was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. The committee held a hearing on February 4, 1954, and the nomination was reported on February 8, 1954. In the case of this nomination, a complaint had been filed against the nominee. A subcommittee heard the complainant and his witnesses on the 4th day of February, and the nomination was reported on February 8, 1954.

The nomination of Vernon Woock to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 2, 1954. The committee held a hearing on February 18, 1954, and the nomination was reported on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of Robert Tieken to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on February 24, 1954. A hearing was held on March 12, 1954, and the nomination was reported on March 15, 1954.

I issue the same invitation heretofore extended to other Senators to the two Senators from Illinois. If there was any delay or if there was inaction on the part of the senior Senator from North Dakota, the chairman of the committee, for the reasons alleged by the Fargo Forum on August 5 in its false charges, let them speak either now or at any time before the Senate adjourns, because I am giving the dates when action was taken on the nominations.

I come now to Indiana. The first nomination by the President was that of Joseph H. Lesh to be United States attorney. His nomination was referred to the committee on May 1, 1953. A hearing was held on May 14, 1953, and the nomination was reported on May 18, 1953.

The nomination by the President of Jack Chapler Brown to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on July 11, 1953. A hearing was held on July 21, 1953, and the nomination was reported on July 27, 1953.

The nomination of Roy M. Amis to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on July 11, 1953. A hearing was held on July 24, 1953, and the nomination was reported on July 27, 1953, 3 days later.

The nomination of Dove N. Laramore to be a judge of the United States Court of Claims was referred to the committee on February 15, 1954. A hearing was held on March 12, 1954, and the nomination was reported on March 15, 1954.

The nomination of W. Lynn Parkinson to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on August 2, 1954. The Senate had already adjourned when the committee reported the nomination 3 days later, on August 5, 1954.

The same is true of the nomination of Hale J. Holder to be United States district judge. His nomination was referred to the committee on August 2, 1954, with the full endorsement of the Senators from Indiana. The nomination was reported by the committee on August 5, 1954.

I extend the invitation heretofore given to the two Senators from Indiana. I shall be glad to have them rise in the Senate at any time before adjournment and state if there was any ulterior motive or any delay on the part of the senior Senator from North Dakota in connection with the nominations from Indiana.

I come now to the State of Kansas. The nomination of George Templar to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on July 28, 1953. The Senators from Kansas had already brought Mr. Templar to the office of the committee, where we interrogated him.

We had already had an FBI report on him. Only 2 days later, July 30, the committee reported his nomination to the Senate.

The nomination of Eugene Kemper to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. On February 16, 1954, Mr. Kemper was heard by a subcommittee, and on February 24, 1954, just 8 days later, his nomination was reported by the full committee.

I issue the same invitation to the two Senators from Kansas. There was no delay in the action taken on nominations from Kansas or any other State.

I come now to Kentucky. The nomination of Edwin R. Denney to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on June 8, 1953. A hearing was held on July 2, 1953, and the nomination was reported on July 13, 1953, 11 days later.

The nomination of J. Leonard Walker to be United States attorney was first reported to the committee on August 1, 1953. Apparently the committee could not take action because the Senate had adjourned. So the nomination was referred again to the committee on January 11, 1954. A hearing was held on February 17, 1954, and the nomination was reported on February 24, 7 days later.

The next is a nomination to the War Claims Commission. That nomination was withdrawn.

We come next to the State of Louisiana. George R. Blue was nominated to be United States attorney. The nomination was reported to our committee on the 22d of June 1953. The subcommittee heard him on the 7th of July, and it was reported on the 27th of July.

Benjamin C. Dawkins, Jr., was nominated to be United States district judge. It was reported to the committee on the 21st of July 1953, the hearing was held on July 30, 1953, and on the same day that the subcommittee heard him, it reported the nomination.

Edwin F. Hunter, Jr., was nominated to be United States district judge. The nomination was received by the committee on the 11th of January 1954. As everyone knows, there was a delay, because of the necessity of organizing the Senate, for 2 or 3 weeks in both cases. The committee could not take that nomination up until February 4, 1954, and it was reported out on February 8, 1954.

The nomination of Edward J. Petitbon to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 22, 1954. The subcommittee heard him on February 19, 1954, and reported the nomination 5 days later, on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of T. Fitzhugh Wilson to be United States attorney was reported to the committee on July 11, 1953, the subcommittee heard him on the 21st of July 1953, and reported the nomination 6 days later, on July 27, 1953.

I issue the same invitations heretofore mentioned by me, to the two Senators from Louisiana. If they can find any delay, I should like to have them point it out to me.

I next come to the State of Maine. The nomination of Peter Milis to be United States attorney was referred to

the committee on July 28, 1953. Both that nomination and the nomination of Harry W. Pinkham to be United States attorney came to the committee on the same day, July 28, 1953. The subcommittee had already talked to the nominees, and both nominations were reported 2 days later, on July 30, 1953.

I now come to the State of Maryland. The nomination of William P. Rogers to be Deputy Attorney General was referred to the committee on January 22, 1953. We had a hearing on January 26, 1953, before the subcommittee, and the nomination was reported on the same day, January 26, 1953.

The nomination of Robert C. Watson to be Commissioner of Patents came to the committee on January 22, 1953. The subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], had a hearing on the nomination on February 9, 1953. The subcommittee reported the nomination on the same day, February 9, 1953.

We come now to the nomination of Joseph R. Kincaid to be United States marshal, whose nomination came to the committee on March 30, 1953. The subcommittee heard him on April 9, 1953. Four days later, on April 13, 1953, the nomination was reported.

The nomination of Arthur W. Crocker to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents was referred to the committee on June 3, 1953. A hearing was held on July 2, 1953, and the nomination was reported 11 days later, on July 13, 1953.

The nomination of Byron H. Carpenter to be Examiner in Chief of the Patent Office was referred to the committee on June 8, 1953. A hearing was held on July 2, 1953, and the nomination was reported on July 13, 1953. Both of those hearings were held by a subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who at that time was busy on other matters, and, as I understand it took 2 weeks or so before hearings could be held on the nominations.

The nomination of George C. Doub to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on July 21, 1953. The subcommittee heard him on July 30, 1953, and reported the nomination on the same day, July 30, 1953.

The nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff to be Solicitor General of the United States was referred to the committee on January 2, 1953. The subcommittee heard him on February 4, 1954. Four days later the nomination was reported by the subcommittee.

The nomination of Roszel C. Thomsen to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on March 15, 1954. There were hearings held on March 31, 1954, and on April 7, 1954, and the full committee reported the nomination on May 10, 1954.

I now come to the State of Massachusetts. The nomination of H. Brian Holland to be Assistant Attorney General was referred to the committee on January 22, 1953. The subcommittee heard him on January 28, 1953, and reported the nomination on the same day.

The nomination of Anthony Julian to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on February 27, 1953.

The hearing was held on March 10, 1953. Six days later, on March 16, 1953, the nomination was reported by the full committee.

The nomination of R. H. Beaudreau to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on February 27, 1953. The subcommittee heard him on March 10, 1953. Six days later, on March 16, 1953, the nomination was reported by the committee.

The nomination of Bailey Aldrich to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on April 1, 1954. A hearing was held on April 15, 1954. Seven days later, on April 22, 1954, the full committee reported the nomination to the Senate floor.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Massachusetts that was extended to the Senators of all the other States.

We now come to Michigan. The nomination of Frederick W. Kaess to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on May 1, 1953. The subcommittee heard him on May 14, 1953. Full committee action took place 4 days later, on May 18, 1953.

The nomination of Wendell A. Wiles to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on May 13, 1953. The subcommittee heard him on May 20, 1953, and on June 4 it was reported by the full committee.

The nomination of Harry Jennings to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on July 11, 1953. The subcommittee heard him on July 21, 1953. Six days later on July 27, 1953, the nomination was reported by the full committee.

The nomination of William A. Nowicki to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on May 3, 1954. The subcommittee heard him on May 14, 1954. Three days later, on May 17, 1954, the nomination was reported.

The nomination of Ralph M. Freeman to be United States judge was referred to the committee on May 10, 1954. The subcommittee heard him on May 25, 1954. On June 7, 1954, his nomination was reported.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Michigan that I have extended to the Senators of all the other States.

It is not often that there is a deliberate falsehood published in a newspaper, done deliberately to wreck a United States Senator, as was done by the Fargo Forum on August 5, 1954. It is not so often that one can produce proof to show that a newspaper has deliberately falsified, as can be shown by this record, and by calling upon every Senator on this floor who, if he felt for a single moment that any of the nominations were held up, could rise on the floor and say so. The charge made by this newspaper is a charge against all Members of the United States Senate.

We come now to the State of Minnesota. The nomination of Warren E. Burger to be Assistant Attorney General was referred to the committee on January 22, 1953. There was a hearing by the full committee on January 26, 1953, and the nomination was reported on the same day.

The nomination of George E. Mackinnon to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on February 27, 1953. Some charges were filed, particularly by a newspaper editor in Minnesota. We investigated those charges. Three weeks later, on March 17, 1953, the subcommittee reported to the full committee, and 2 days later, on March 19, 1953, the full committee reported the nomination.

Evard Erickson, United States marshal: The nomination came to the Senate on the 27th of February 1953. The subcommittee heard him on the 10th of March 1953. Six days later the nomination was reported by the full committee.

George J. Reed to be a member of the Parole Board: The nomination came to us on the 23d of July 1953. A week later the hearing was held, on the 30th of July 1953. On that same day the full committee reported the nomination.

I issue the same invitation to the two Senators from Minnesota.

Let us come now to the State of Mississippi. The nomination of Robert E. Hauberg came in on the 11th of January 1954. A hearing was held on the 16th day of February 1954. A week later, on the 24th of February 1954, it was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Thomas Ethridge for United States attorney came in on the 2d of March 1954. The subcommittee heard him on the 12th of March 1954. Three days later, on the 15th day of March 1954, the nomination was reported.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Mississippi.

Let us come now to the State of Missouri.

The nomination of Edward L. Scheufler to be United States attorney came in on the 30th of March 1953. The subcommittee heard him on the 9th of April 1953. Four days later the full committee reported the nomination.

The nomination of Omar L. Schnatmeier for United States marshal came in on the 30th of March 1953. The subcommittee heard that matter on the 9th of April 1953, and the full committee reported the nomination on the 13th of April 1953, 4 days later.

The nomination of Harry Richards to be United States attorney came in on the 24th of June 1953. The subcommittee heard him on the 7th of July 1953. Six days later, on the 13th of July 1953, the nomination was reported by the full committee.

The nomination of Scovel Richardson to be a member of the Parole Board came to us on the 23d of July 1953. The full committee heard him on the 30th of July 1953. The nomination was reported by a unanimous vote on the same day.

The nomination of Charles E. Whitaker to be United States district judge came to us on the 11th of May 1954. The subcommittee heard him on the 25th of May 1954. On the 6th of July 1954, the nomination was reported.

The nomination of John Burke Dennis to be United States marshal came in on the 11th of May 1954. A hearing was held on the 25th of May 1954. On the

7th day of June 1954 the full committee reported the nomination.

I issue the same invitation to the two Senators from Missouri as was issued before.

I see the distinguished Senators from Montana on the floor. Let me refer to the record for Montana.

The nomination of Krest Cyr to be United States attorney came to us from the President on the 11th of July 1953. A hearing was held on the 21st of July 1953. The nomination was reported by the full committee on the 27th day of July 1953.

The nomination of Louis C. Aleksich to be United States marshal came to us on the 11th of January 1954. A hearing was held. There was objection filed. The distinguished Senator himself appeared at the time of that hearing before the subcommittee.

However, on the 18th of February 1954, the nomination was reported favorably. In 6 days the full committee reported the nomination. I issued the same invitation to the Senators from Montana as was issued to other Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to say on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself that the nominations of the Republican appointees to the positions referred to by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary were given prompt and speedy action and approval. We wish to commend the chairman for the speed and diligence which he showed at least so far as these particular appointments in the State of Montana were concerned. As usual, the chairman was on the job and doing his very best.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MURRAY rose.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the senior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. I am glad my colleague has made that observation because we all know how diligent the Senator from North Dakota has always been, not only with regard to matters of this character, but with regard to all problems which come before his committee.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator.

May I refer now to the State of Nebraska? The nomination of J. Lee Rankin to be Assistant Attorney General came to us on the 22d day of January 1953. The subcommittee heard him 4 days later, on the 26th of January. The full committee reported the nomination January 26, 1953, Mr. President. The full committee heard him and reported the nomination on the same day—4 days after the nomination had come in.

We come now to the nomination of Perry W. Morton to be Assistant Attorney General. The nomination came in on the 13th day of July 1953. The full committee heard him and reported the nomination on the 27th day of July 1953.

The nomination of Donald R. Ross to be United States attorney came in on the 30th of July 1953. The adjournment took place. Mr. Ross' nomination came back on the 11th of January 1954.

The subcommittee heard him on the 17th of February 1954. One week later, on the 24th of February 1954, they reported the nomination.

The nomination of William Raab to be United States marshal came to us on the 25th of February 1954. The subcommittee heard him on the 12th day of March 1954. The nomination was reported on the 29th day of March 1954.

I issue the same invitation to the two Senators from that State.

Let us come now to the State of Nevada. Madison B. Groves was nominated to be United States attorney by the President on the 11th of January 1954. The hearing was held on the 26th of February 1954. The nomination was reported on the 8th of March 1954.

The nomination of John R. Ross to be United States district judge came to us on the 3d of May 1954. The hearing was held on the 10th of May 1954. The nomination was reported to the full committee on the 10th of May 1954, the same day.

Cedric E. Stewart was nominated to be United States marshal on the 19th of January 1954. The nomination was held up at the request of some people, so that an investigation could be made. A hearing was held on the 8th of March 1954, and the next day after the hearing the nomination was reported.

I issue the same invitation to those Senators.

We come now to New Hampshire. George A. Colbath was nominated to be United States marshal on the 11th of July 1953. The subcommittee heard him on the 21st of July 1953. The nomination was reported on the 27th of July 1953, 6 days later.

Maurice Paul Bois was nominated to be United States attorney on the 22d of January 1954. All Senators are familiar with the situation at that time, when the Senate was organizing. However, the subcommittee heard him on the 19th of February 1954. Five days later the nomination was reported by the full committee, on the 24th of February 1954.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from New Hampshire which I previously issued to the other Senators.

Let us come now to the State of New Jersey.

Dallas S. Townsend was nominated to be Assistant Attorney General. His nomination came in the first day of May, 1953. A hearing was held on the 19th day of May 1953. The full committee reported the nomination on the 4th of June 1953.

The nomination of William F. Tompkins to be United States attorney came in on the 8th of June 1953. We heard him before the full committee and reported the nomination on the 23d of June, 1953.

The nomination of Joseph F. Job to be United States marshal came in on the 10th of May, 1954. The subcommittee heard him on the 25th of May 1954. The full committee reported the nomination on the 7th of June 1954.

The nomination of Raymond Del Tufo to be United States attorney came in on the 13th of May 1954. We heard him on the 25th of May 1954, and the full com-

mittee reported the nomination on the 6th day of July 1954.

The nomination of William F. Tompkins to be Assistant Attorney General came in on the 13th of May 1954. A hearing was held on the 25th of May 1954. The full committee reported the nomination on the 6th day of July 1954.

Those two nominations were held up, because these men were to be placed in charge of a special division to deal with subversives created by the Attorney General. There was a request from some of the Senators who have charge of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary for a thorough investigation. That investigation, as I remember, was conducted by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], using the care they should have taken and the precaution they should have taken in considering nominations for these very, very important positions. They took some 3 or 4 weeks to make a thorough investigation, and I commend them for it. Certainly no one can say there was any unnecessary delay in this matter in taking 4 or 5 weeks while the qualifications and background of Mr. Tompkins for this particular position were thoroughly investigated.

I might add that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENBRICKSON], as one of the members of the full committee, offered no objection while that investigation was taking place.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am trying to inform myself as to the background of the Senator's speech and his complaint.

Mr. LANGER. It is based on a paragraph in the Fargo Forum. I shall be glad to read it again for the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. Rogers, the Deputy Attorney General, issued a statement saying that no nominations have been held up. Then this newspaper, the Fargo Forum—mind you, they do not quote from the United Press or the Associated Press, but they themselves assert:

Despite these statements—

Referring to Mr. Rogers' statements that there was no delay of any kind and that the Senator from North Dakota had never for any ulterior purposes held up any nominations, which is the charge made—this newspaper said:

Despite these statements, however, it is known some Senators feel LANGER has unnecessarily sidetracked, temporarily at least, nominations affecting their States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I wish only to testify in regard to my experience with the Senator from North Dakota in connection with Oregon nominations. Of course, I am sure the Senator from North Dakota knows that the representative of the Independent Party does not have anything

to say about appointments in the State of Oregon, and I think that is the way it should be. I do not quarrel about the procedure which is followed by this administration in making patronage appointments in the State of Oregon. I think the party in control should make the appointments, and I am very happy not to be a member of the party which is in control. I would not want to have on my shoulders the mistakes of this administration in any way whatsoever.

Be that as it may, as a Senator from Oregon, I am requested by the Judiciary Committee to give so-called clearance on Oregon appointments. I want to testify as to my experience with the Senator from North Dakota as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] when he was chairman of the Judiciary Committee under a previous administration.

I do not see how two men could have acted more promptly and more courteously and with greater consideration on appointments involving the State of Oregon than the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. My experience with both Senators, and my experience with the Senator from North Dakota under this administration, has been a most pleasant one. I have received prompt notice of any appointments in Oregon, and those appointments in turn have received fair and prompt consideration from the Senator from North Dakota, as they did previously from the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. LANGER. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that the Judiciary Committee is one committee in which, so far as I know, there is absolutely no politics. Every member of that committee serves on a subcommittee and, in my opinion, has done a good job on these nominations. Whenever the nominations are referred to a subcommittee, FBI reports have been provided promptly, and they have been gone into thoroughly. Some of us do not like the way the FBI reports go, but that is a matter which under a present resolution will be taken up next year when we meet again.

I wish to assure every Senator that whenever nominations come to the Judiciary Committee every single member of the committee, so far as I know, who serves on a subcommittee, has met at the time when the subcommittee was supposed to meet, or if he could not be there, he telephoned and said, "You two men of the subcommittee act in my absence and tell me about it afterwards." We have acted promptly. There has not been any ulterior motive on the part of any member of the committee, so far as I know, and most certainly I can testify that is true of the senior Senator from North Dakota, its chairman.

Continuing with New Jersey, the nomination of Mrs. R. W. Leeds to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents came in on the 17th day of July, and it was promptly considered.

After Mrs. Leeds' nomination had been withdrawn the first time, it came back the second time on the 29th of July, and she was confirmed the next day because

we had already held hearings when her name came down on the 17th of July.

The nomination of Paul Wilbur Tappan as member, Parole Board, came in on the 23d of July, and the subcommittee heard him on the 30th of July. On the same day the nomination was reported to the full committee.

I issue the same invitation to the Senator from New Jersey.

Now we come to New Mexico:

The name of George W. Beach to be United States marshal was sent to the Senate by the President on the 18th of April. The subcommittee met on the 30th of April. The full committee reported the nomination on the 4th of May.

The President sent the nomination of Paul F. Larrazola to be United States attorney on the 11th of July; the subcommittee heard testimony on the 21st of July, and the full committee acted on the 27th of July, 6 days later.

Waldo H. Rogers to be United States judge: The President sent the nomination to the Senate on the 3d of May. The hearing was on the 12th of May, and on the same day the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I issue the same invitation to the Senator from New Mexico.

Now we come to the State of New York. I am delighted to see the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on the floor, and I ask him to take particular note, if he will be so kind as to do so.

Attorney General Brownell's nomination was sent to the Senate on the 19th day of January, and it came before the full committee on the same day. He was interrogated by the full committee. No objection was offered. On the same day, the 19th day of January, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of J. Edward Lumbard to be United States attorney came to the Senate on the 27th day of February; the subcommittee heard him on the 10th of March; and on the 23d day of March his nomination was reported by the full committee to the Senate.

The nomination of Walter Bruchhausen to be United States judge was sent to the Senate by the President on the 18th day of April. The subcommittee heard him on the 30th of April, and on the 4th of May his nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of William E. Smith to be United States marshal was sent to the Senate by the President on the 1st of May. The full committee heard him on the 14th of May, and 4 days later, on the 18th of May, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Leonard P. Moore to be United States attorney was sent to the Senate by the President on the 13th of May. The hearing was held on the 20th of May, after due notice had been given. Notice is always given to the Senators so they can appear and listen to the testimony. Likewise, in this case, notice was given. As I have said, the President sent the nomination to the Senate on the 13th of May; the hearing was on the 20th of May, and on June 4 the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Thomas J. Lunney to be United States marshal was sent to the Senate by the President on the 24th of June. The hearing was set for the 7th of July, and 6 days later, on the 13th of July, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Theodore S. Bowes to be United States attorney came to the committee on the 11th of January in 1954. We all know the fact that the Senate was organizing at that time. The hearing on the nomination was held on February 17, 1954, and his nomination was reported to the Senate on February 24, 1954, 1 week later.

The nomination of J. Bradbury German for United States marshal came to the committee on January 11, 1954. A hearing was held on February 16, 1954, and his nomination was reported to the Senate on February 24, 1954.

George M. Glasser, United States marshal: His nomination came to the committee on January 12, 1954. There was a little delay, due to the fact that Congress was organizing. The hearing was held on February 18, 1954. The full committee took action on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of John Marshall Harlan, United States circuit judge, reached the committee on January 13, 1954. A hearing was held on the nomination on February 4, 1954. His nomination was reported to the Senate on February 8, 1954.

The nomination of Alexander Bicks for United States district judge was received by the committee on April 6, 1954. A hearing was held on April 15, 1954. His nomination was reported to the Senate on May 10, 1954.

Archie Dawson, nominated for United States district judge: His nomination came to the committee on April 6, 1954. A hearing was held on the nomination on April 15, 1954, and his nomination was reported to the Senate on April 22, 1954.

Edmund L. Palmieri, nominated for United States district judge: His nomination reached the committee on April 6, 1954. A hearing was held on April 15, 1954. The full committee took action on May 10, 1954.

The nomination of Lawrence Edward Walsh to be United States district judge reached the committee on April 6, 1954, a hearing on it was held on April 15, 1954, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on April 26, 1954.

The nomination of Henry J. Clay to be Foreign Claims Settlement Commissioner reached the committee on July 23, 1954. A hearing was held on August 5, 1954, and the full committee took action on the same day.

The nomination of Raymond T. Armbruster for the War Claims Commission was referred to the committee on February 15, 1954. A hearing on the nomination was held on April 6, 1954. We received word from the White House that the nomination probably would be withdrawn. It was withdrawn on the same day.

John A. Henderson, United States attorney. His nomination came to the committee on April 30, 1953. A hearing was held on May 4, 1953. The committee took action on May 4, 1953.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from New York I have extended to other Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. The junior Senator from New York is very glad indeed to testify to the fact that he has never even heard a suggestion by anyone that there was any unnecessary delay in the consideration of the nominations submitted by the administration for action by the Judiciary Committee. I have never heard the slightest suggestion that there was any unnecessary or unreasonable delay in the consideration of such nominations.

I wish to add one more word. I greatly appreciate the constant and unflinching courtesy that has been shown to me by the committee. I have been invited in advance when nominations came up for consideration, and I have been given every opportunity to appear in support or in opposition to any of the nominations. I had the same experience when the committee was under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. Every courtesy and every opportunity was shown to me, and I am grateful to the Senator from North Dakota, as I am to the other members of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York. I feel proud of the record, and I am grateful to the Senator from New York for what he has said, in the light of the fact, particularly, that he was governor of his State for four terms. He knows that no matter how hard we try, sometimes very slight delays do take place. We are very proud of the committee's record. It is the record of the committee, not the record of the chairman.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, without taking too much of the time of the Senate, that I want to voice the same thought the Senator from New York has expressed. In the one instance, of a nomination from Massachusetts, for a judgeship, the chairman of the committee heard the matter himself, and the judge's nomination was promptly reported.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

North Carolina: William B. Somers, United States marshal. His nomination came before the committee on the first day of May 1953. A hearing was held on May 14, 1953. Four days later, on the 18th of May 1953, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Has the Senator passed over the one outstanding State in the Union, Nevada?

Mr. LANGER. No. I mentioned that State some time ago.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to say in that respect that the Senator from North Dakota has been prompt and the committee has been prompt in acting upon

every nomination. Only one thing has caused me to complain somewhat, and that is with respect to the political affiliation of the appointees. I would rather have had them of a different political affiliation, to be very frank with the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I am sorry that the Senator from North Dakota could not help out the Senator from Nevada in that respect. Unfortunately the Senator from North Dakota does not have much influence with the President and does not pretend to have much influence, at the White House. If the Senator from Nevada has any further nominations coming up from his State, if he will see me, I will be very glad to talk to the President about them.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator very much. I assure him I am grateful to him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield. If I can be of any help to the distinguished Senator from Oregon in getting a good nomination from the Senator from Nevada, perhaps between the two of us we might have some good luck.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure I cannot be very helpful in that respect. Certainly my desire would be to be helpful, if the administration would follow my advice.

However, what I rose to say was that I think that all the record really needs is the statement just made by the Senator from Nevada, with reference to the consideration that his State received. Certainly there has been no delay. The Senator from Nevada spoke as a Senator who has probably had more experience with the Judiciary Committee than any other Senator. When the former chairman of the committee rose to state that there has been no delay, that, in my opinion, was a complete and devastating rebuttal to the article in the North Dakota newspaper.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much. I certainly appreciate the statement of the Senator from Nevada, because he has had many years of experience, as the Senator from Oregon has said, and he knows the difficulties under which the committee labors.

I come now to the State of North Carolina, William B. Somers, United States marshal. His nomination was referred to the committee on May 1, 1953. A hearing was held on May 14, 1953. Four days later, on May 18, 1953, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

James Major Daley, United States attorney: The President sent his nomination to the Senate on May 13, 1953. A hearing was held on May 20, 1953. The full committee took action on June 4, 1953.

Roy A. Harmon, United States marshal: His nomination came to the committee on June 24, 1953. Hearing was held on July 7, 1953. Six days later, on July 13, 1953, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

United States Attorney B. Ray Cohoon: His nomination reached the committee on March 15, 1954. Hearing on the nomination was held on March 31, 1954. His nomination was reported to the Senate on April 5, 1954.

The nomination of Julian T. Gaskill for United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 1, 1954. A hearing was held on February 16, 1954. The committee took action on February 24, 1954, 8 days later.

The nomination of Edwin M. Stanley, United States attorney, was referred to the committee on March 16, 1954. A hearing on the nomination was held on April 5, 1954. On the same day the committee took action on it.

We come now to the State of North Dakota. My distinguished colleague is not on the floor. Three nominations for positions in the State of North Dakota came to the committee. The nomination of Robert Vogel for United States attorney reached the committee on August 4, 1954. Five days later his nomination was reported to the Senate. My colleague and I had already discussed the matter. Both of us knew the gentleman. The same thing is true of Harry R. Tenborg, nominated for United States marshal, and Herbert G. Homme, Jr., nominated for United States attorney. Their nominations came to the committee on August 4, 1954, and the committee acted on them on August 9, 1954, 4 days later.

I issue the same invitation to my colleague from the State of North Dakota, or to any other Senator.

I come now, Mr. President, to the State of Ohio.

The nomination of Howard C. Botts to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on March 23, 1953. Hearing was held on April 2, 1953, and committee action was taken on April 27, 1953.

The nomination of Lester L. Cecil to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on April 1, 1953. Nineteen days later the nomination was reported. There was an objection filed in that case.

The nomination of Thomas J. Herbert to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board was referred to the committee on April 10, 1953. Hearing was held on April 21, 1953, and action was taken on April 27, 1953.

The nomination of Hugh K. Martin to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on June 22, 1953. Hearing was held on July 7, 1953, and action was taken on July 13, 1953.

The nomination of Xavier North to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearings were held on February 16 to 20, 1954, and action was taken on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of Sumner Canary to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 13, 1954, and because of organizing the committee, a hearing was not held until February 17, 1954. On February 24, 1954, action was taken by the committee.

The nomination of Thomas J. Herbert to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board was referred to the committee on March 18, 1954, and action was taken by the committee on April 5, 1954.

The nomination of Potter Stewart to be United States circuit judge was referred to the committee on April 6, 1954.

Hearing was held on April 15, 1954, and action was taken on April 22, 1954.

Talk about service, Mr. President; talk about paying attention to business—who could do a better job?

The nomination of James C. Connell to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on June 25, 1954. Hearing was held on August 9, 1954, and the nomination was reported on the same day.

I issue the same invitation to any Senator to find any single one, out of the scores of nominations, that was held up.

I come now to the State of Oklahoma.

The nomination of Frank D. McSherry to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on May 15, 1953. Hearing was held on May 28, 1953, and action was taken on June 4, 1953.

The nomination of Paul Johnson to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on July 21, 1953. Hearing was had on July 30, 1953, and action was taken on the same day.

The nomination of James Y. Victor to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on July 21, 1953. Hearing was had on July 30, 1953, and action was taken on the same day.

The nomination of B. Hayden Crawford to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on May 10, 1954. Hearing was had on May 25, 1954, and action was taken on July 6, 1954.

The nomination of K. W. Greer to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on May 12, 1954. Hearing was had on May 25, 1954, and on June 7, 1954, action by the committee was taken.

The nomination of Paul W. Cress to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on July 10, 1954. On July 22, 1954, hearing was had, and action was taken on July 2, 1954.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Oklahoma, or other Senators, to state that there was any delay in those cases.

I come now to the State of Oregon. I notice the distinguished Senator from that State [Mr. MORSE] is present.

The nomination of Harold Sexton to be United States marshal was referred to the Judiciary Committee on June 24, 1953. Hearing was had on July 7, 1953, and action was taken on July 13, 1953.

The nomination of Dorothy M. Lee to be a member of the parole board was referred to the committee on July 23, 1953. Hearing was held on July 30, 1953, and action was taken on the same day.

The nomination of Clarence E. Luckey to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 29, 1954. Hearing was held on February 19, 1954, and action was taken on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of James A. Fee to be United States circuit judge was referred to the committee on April 6, 1954. On April 15, 1954, hearing was held, and on April 22, 1954, action was taken.

I say to my distinguished friend from Oregon that those cases, in my opinion, are typical. That is the way we have handled nominations coming from all the other States. There has never been any politics involved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to testify that as to each one of those nominations I received notice from the committee advising me, first, of the nomination; second, as to when the hearing would be held, and an invitation to appear before the committee to present my views on any one of those nominations, if I cared to do so. That is the treatment which I have always received from the committee. Again I wish to say that, in my judgment, there is no basis whatsoever for any charge that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee has been holding up nominations sent to that committee, by way of any device of delay.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

I now come to the State of Pennsylvania. I am delighted to see the senior Senator from Pennsylvania present in the Chamber. I invite him to say whether the Senator from North Dakota has held up any nomination from that State, and I ask him whether time after time he has not appeared before the full committee and whether every member of the committee has been courteous to him.

The nomination of J. P. Willson to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on June 8, 1953. Hearing was held on July 2, 1953, and on July 13, 1953, action was taken.

The nomination of J. Julius Levy to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on June 8, 1953. Hearing was held on July 2, 1953, and action was taken on July 27, 1953.

The nomination of John W. McIlvaine to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on June 8, 1953. On July 2, 1953, hearing was held, and on July 13, 1953, action was taken.

The nomination of W. Wilson White to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearing was held on February 26, 1954, and on March 29, 1954, action was taken.

The nomination of John W. Lord, Jr., to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on March 29, 1954. Hearing was held on May 12, 1954, and on May 17, 1954, action was taken.

The nomination of William A. O'Brien to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on June 29, 1954. Hearing was held on July 9, 1954, and action was taken on July 13, 1954.

The nomination of John L. Miller, to be United States district judge, was referred to the committee on March 29, 1954. Hearing was held on May 12, 1954, and action was taken on May 17, 1954.

I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he knows of any delay in connection with any nomination in his State?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has been very courteous to me as a Senator from Pennsylvania. I have appeared before his committee, and he has been very con-

siderate of what I had to say. I have no criticism of him whatsoever.

He has held up one nomination, at my request, hoping that certain problems might be worked out. But that was the only one which was held up, and that was done at my request and the request of my colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF].

Mr. LANGER. I am very grateful for the generous statement made by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

I come now to Rhode Island.

The nomination of Jacob S. Temkin to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on May 28, 1953. A hearing was held on June 11, 1953. On June 15, 1953, 4 days later, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Howard S. Proctor to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on June 24, 1953. The committee held a hearing on July 7, 1953. Six days later, on July 13, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Edward William Day to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. The committee held a hearing on February 4, 1954, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on February 8, 1954.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Rhode Island. They can rise on the floor of the Senate at any time they wish to between now and the time the Senate adjourns if they have any objection to the way nominations from Rhode Island were handled by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I come now to South Carolina. The nomination of U. Welch Morrisette to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. Some objections were filed to the nomination. Hearings were held on four occasions, but on March 29, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Joseph E. Hines to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on March 8, 1954. An objection was filed at the hearing. A thorough investigation was made by the chairman of the subcommittee, and witnesses were subpoenaed before the subcommittee. One witness refused to appear, and did not appear. Finally, with the full consent of the Senators from South Carolina, the nomination was reported to the Senate on July 17, 1954.

I come now to the State of South Dakota.

The nomination of Bernard A. Boos to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on March 23, 1953. A hearing was held on April 2, 1953. Eleven days later the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Clinton G. Richards to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on May 15, 1953. A hearing was held on May 28, 1953, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on June 4, 1953, 7 days later.

The nomination of George T. Mickelson to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. The committee was late in organizing at the beginning of this year

and a hearing was not held until February 4, 1954. The nomination was reported to the Senate on February 8, 1954, 4 days after the hearing.

I shall be glad at any time to have either of the Senators from South Dakota rise on the floor to state if there was any ulterior motive for the purpose of exerting any pressure or incurring any delay in connection with nominations from South Dakota.

I come now to Tennessee. I regret that the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, who interrupted me earlier, is not present on the floor. Here is the record for Tennessee.

The nomination of John C. Crawford to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on June 24, 1953. A hearing was held on July 7, 1953. The committee reported the nomination on July 13, 1953, 6 days later.

The nomination of Millsaps Fitzhugh was referred to the committee on June 24, 1953. A hearing was held on July 7, 1953, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on July 13, 1953, 6 days later.

The nomination of Fred Elledge, Jr., to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on August 3, 1953. There was no opportunity to hold a hearing on the nomination before the Senate adjourned, so the nomination was not reported at that time. The nomination was again referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. A hearing was held on February 19, 1954, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on March 8, 1954, approximately 20 days later.

The nomination of Frank Quarles to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. A hearing was held on February 19, 1954, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on February 24, 1954. The delay in action between January 11, 1954, and February 19, 1954, was because the committee did not organize until late.

The nomination of John O. Anderson to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. The committee held a hearing on February 19, 1954, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of William E. Smith to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on April 6, 1954. A hearing was held on May 14, 1954, and on May 24, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I invite the two Senators from Tennessee to state at any time before the Senate adjourns if they have any objection.

I come now to Texas.

The nomination of Albert W. Saegert to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on May 1, 1953. A hearing was held on May 14, 1953, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on May 18, 1953, 4 days later.

The nomination of William M. Steger to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on June 22, 1953. The committee held a hearing on July 7, 1953, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on July 13, 1953, 6 days later.

The nomination of Heard L. Floore to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on July 30, 1953. The Senate adjourned on August 3, and no hearing was held. The nomination was again referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. A hearing was held on February 17, 1954, and the nomination was reported on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of Emmett M. Smith to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. The committee held a hearing on February 26, 1954, and the nomination was reported on March 29, 1954.

The nomination of Malcolm R. Wilkey to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 27, 1954. The committee held a hearing on February 18, 1954, and the nomination was reported on February 24, 1954.

The nomination of Joe M. Ingraham to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on May 10, 1954. A hearing was held on May 25, 1954, and the nomination was reported on August 5, 1954. The reason for the delay in action on the nomination was that a great many objections were filed, and the committee conducted a careful investigation of the nomination.

The nomination of Charles P. McKnight to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on February 26, 1954. The hearing was held on March 29, 1954, and the nomination was reported on March 30, 1954, 1 day later.

The nomination of Hobart K. McDowell to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on February 26, 1954. A hearing was held on March 29, 1954, and 1 day later, March 30, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I come now to Utah.

The nomination of A. Pratt Kesler to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on April 18, 1953. A hearing was held on April 30, 1953, and on May 4, 1953, the nomination was reported.

The nomination of Howard Call to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on May 1, 1953. A hearing was held on May 14, 1953, and the nomination was reported on May 18, 1953, 4 days later.

The nomination of A. S. Christenson to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on May 12, 1954. A hearing was held on May 24, 1954, and the nomination was reported on May 25, 1954, 1 day later.

The nomination of David J. Wilson to be a judge of the Customs Court was referred to the committee on July 7, 1954. A hearing was held on July 16, 1954, and the nomination was reported on July 24, 1954, 8 days later.

I issue the same invitation to the two Senators from Utah as I have issued to other Senators.

I come now to Vermont.

The nomination of Louis G. Whitcomb to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. On February 16, 1954, the committee held a hearing, and on February 24, 1954, 8 days later, the nomination was reported.

The nomination of Dewey H. Perry to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on January 22, 1954. On February 19, 1954, a hearing was held by the committee, and on February 24, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Vermont as I issued to other Senators.

I come now to Virginia.

The nomination of Lester Shields Parsons to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on February 15, 1953. A hearing was held on May 28, 1953, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on June 4, 1953, 6 days later.

The nomination of John Strickler to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on June 8, 1953. A hearing was held on July 2, 1953, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on July 13, 1953, 11 days later.

The nomination of Richard S. Simpson to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on June 25, 1953. A hearing was held on July 7, 1953, and the nomination was reported on July 13, 1953.

The nomination of George G. Killenger to be a member of the Parole Board was referred to the committee on July 23, 1953. A hearing was held on July 30, 1953, and on the same day the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Peter A. Richmond to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on July 30, 1953. The Senate adjourned within a few days, so the nomination was again referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. A hearing was held on February 16, 1954, and the nomination was reported to the Senate on February 24, 1954, 8 days later.

The nomination of Walter E. Hoffman was referred to the committee on June 29, 1954. A hearing was held on July 9, 1954, and the nomination was reported on July 13, 1954, 4 days later.

I extend to the Senators from Virginia the same invitation I have extended to other Senators.

I come now to the State of Washington. The nomination of Harry P. Cain to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board was sent to the committee on April 10, 1953. The subcommittee heard the matter on April 21, 1953. Six days later the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Darrell P. Holmes, to be United States marshal, was referred to the committee on May 1, 1953. The subcommittee heard the matter on May 14, 1953. Four days later, on May 18, 1953, the nomination was reported to the floor.

The nomination of William B. Parsons to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on May 1, 1953. The committee heard the matter on May 14, 1953. Four days later, on May 18, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Nogi A. Asp to be chief examiner, Patent Office, was referred to the committee on June 8, 1953. The hearing was held on July 2, 1953.

Eleven days later, on July 13, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of George H. Boldt to be United States district judge was referred to the committee on June 10, 1953. On July 2, 1953, the matter was heard by the subcommittee. Eleven days later, on July 13, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Harry P. Cain to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board was referred to the committee on June 18, 1953. No hearing was necessary, since his record had been gone over. His term expired on June 18, 1953. On July 30, 1953, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of William B. Bantz to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on July 21, 1953. Hearings were held, and on the same day, July 30, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Charles P. Moriarty to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on July 28, 1953. The full committee heard the matter at the request of the subcommittee. Two days later, on July 30, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I issue the same invitation to the two Senators from Washington that I did to the Senators from the other States.

I now come to the State of West Virginia.

The nomination of Duncan W. Daugherty to be United States attorney was referred to the committee on January 11, 1954. Objections were filed, and hearings were held on February 26, 1954, and March 19, 1954. Ten days later, on March 29, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Herbert S. Boreman to be United States district judge came to the committee on June 22, 1954. Hearings were held on July 9, 1954. Ten days later the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I issue the same invitations to the Senators from West Virginia that I extended to Senators from other States.

I now come to the State of Wisconsin.

The nomination of George E. Rapp to be United States attorney came to the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearings were held on February 16 and February 20, 1954. On February 24, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Ray H. Schoonover to be United States marshal was referred to the committee on March 4, 1954. Hearings were held on March 31, 1954, and on April 5, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Wisconsin that I issue to the Senators from all the other States.

I come now to the State of Wyoming.

The nomination of John F. Raper, Jr., to be United States attorney reached the committee on March 23, 1953. A hearing was held by the subcommittee on April 2, 1953. Eleven days later, on April 13, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The nomination of Noah W. Riley to be United States marshal was received by the committee on May 1, 1953. Hearings were held by the subcommittee on

May 14, 1953. Four days later, on May 18, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I issue the same invitation to the Senators from Wyoming that I issue to the Senators from other States.

I now come to the Territory of Alaska.

The nomination of Theodore E. Munson to be United States attorney was received from the President by the committee on July 29, 1954. The nomination was reported to the Senate on August 9, 1954.

The President sent the nomination of James L. McCarrey, Jr., to be United States district attorney to the committee on January 11, 1954. Hearings were held on February 4, 1954. Objections were filed and heard. On March 29, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The President sent to the committee the nomination of William T. Plummer to be United States attorney on January 11, 1954. Objections were filed. Hearings were held on February 17, 1954. On April 26, 1954, the nomination was reported to the floor of the Senate.

The President sent to the committee on January 11, 1954, the nomination of Claire A. Wilder to be United States marshal. Hearings were held on February 17, 1954. Seven days later, on February 24, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The President sent to the committee on January 11, 1954, the nomination of Fred S. Williamson to be United States marshal. Hearings were held on February 17, 1954, and 7 days later, on February 24, 1954, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

The President sent to the committee on January 11, 1954, the nomination of Albert F. Dorsh to be United States marshal. The subcommittee held hearings on February 17, 1954. Seven days later, on February 24, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The President sent to the committee on February 2, 1954, the nomination of Walter H. Hodge to be United States district judge. Hearings were held on February 19, 1954. On February 24, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The President sent to the committee on February 25, 1954, the nomination of Theodore F. Stevens to be United States attorney. Hearings were held on March 12, 1954. On March 29, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I issue to the Delegate from Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT, the same invitation I have extended to Senators. If he has not had prompt action, as rapidly as the subcommittee and the full Committee on the Judiciary could act, I wish he would say so.

I come now to the District of Columbia.

The President sent to the committee on March 17, 1953, the nomination of Leo A. Rover to be United States attorney. Hearings were held on March 25, 1953. Objections were filed and objections were heard, and within 16 days, on April 13, 1953, the nomination was reported to the Senate floor.

The President sent to the committee on July 23, 1953, the nomination of

Richard A. Chappell to be a member of the Parole Board. Hearings were held on July 30, 1953, before the full committee, and on the same day the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The President sent to the committee on April 5, 1954, the nomination of Melvin H. Friedman to be Chief Examiner, Patent Office. Hearings were held on May 14, 1954. Three days later, on May 17, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

I issued the same invitation to those interested from the District of Columbia as I have extended to other Senators from States.

I come now to the Territory of Hawaii. The nomination of Albert M. Felix, to be United States circuit judge, was received by the committee on July 28, 1953. Objections were filed. The subcommittee has been holding hearings ever since, and is still hearing witnesses.

The President sent to the committee on January 1, 1954, the nomination of Harry R. Hewitt, to be United States circuit judge. The subcommittee heard him on February 5, 1954. Some complaints were filed. The committee reported the nomination on February 5, 1954.

The President sent to the committee on January 11, 1954, the nomination of Calvin C. McGregor, to be United States circuit judge. Hearings were held on February 5, 1954. Three days later, on February 8, 1954, his nomination was reported to the Senate.

The President sent to the committee on January 13, 1954, the nomination of Frank McKinley, to be United States district judge. Hearings were held on February 5, 1954. A thorough investigation was made. Some complaints had been filed. They were found to be without foundation. The nomination was reported to the Senate on April 26, 1954.

The President sent to the committee on April 14, 1954, the nomination of Thomas R. Clark to be United States marshal. Hearings were held on May 14, 1954. Three days later, on May 17, 1954, the nomination was reported to the Senate.

The President sent to the committee on July 28, 1954, the nomination of Louis B. Blissard to be United States attorney. The full committee had a hearing on August 5, 1954, and on the same day the nomination was reported by the full committee.

I have taken the time of the Senate to go into the matter thoroughly. I believe it was worth taking the hour and a half or so that it took, because when stories of that kind are printed in newspapers they are a reflection upon every member of the committee.

I wish to say that it is a great pleasure for the chairman of the committee to say that he has had the active cooperation of the members of the committee. There has been no horse trading or politics. It is just a matter of realizing, as was true 2 years ago, when the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was chairman of the committee, that 54 percent of all the bills introduced in the Senate are referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and checked by it. The former able chairman of

the committee, the Senator from Nevada, himself told me many, many times that he spent many extra hours going over FBI reports.

I wish to tell the Senate that it is a terrific job for the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to have to analyze FBI reports on United States marshals, district judges, and United States attorneys. The chairman of the committee has to spend many nights going over the FBI reports and examining them in detail. Under the rule, only the chairman of the committee can see the FBI reports. He has to be ready to answer any questions which may be asked by any members of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee or by any member of the full committee. I well remember that when the senior Senator from Nevada was chairman of the committee, he had to go to the hospital at one time, because of overwork as chairman.

Mr. President, I have tried to be a good chairman of the committee, and I have tried to follow in the footsteps of the able chairmen who have preceded me. Ever since taking my oath of office as a Senator, I have done my best to do my duty in all ways; and ever since I have had responsibility of chairman on the Judiciary Committee, I have followed out my firm determination never to "blackjack" any nomination.

Of course, Mr. President, it is easy for articles of that sort to be published by newspapers such as the Fargo Forum, whose policy for years has been to lie and lie and keep on lying about me in the hope that ultimately some of the people of North Dakota would believe some of the lies. That was the policy of that newspaper when I was governor of North Dakota, and it has continued to be its policy ever since I have been in the United States Senate. But such articles reflect upon the Judiciary Committee and, in fact, upon the entire Senate, for they imply that the Senate would tolerate a condition of the sort referred to in the article, in case such a condition actually did exist. As far as I am personally concerned I doubt whether many North Dakotans would believe them anyhow.

Mr. President, I believe it has been well worth while for me to use the hour and one-half I have taken at this time to place in the RECORD ample and complete proof of the actual conduct of the committee. It shows that the newspaper did not tell the truth. I do not have the least doubt that some of my colleagues have experienced similar attacks when they have been candidates for office, or after they have been elected, even though they have been trying to do their duty and to live up to their oath of office.

I wish to say that so long as I am a Member of the Senate—whether I serve as chairman of a committee or as a Member of the Senate without a committee chairmanship—I shall owe no allegiance to any newspaper in North Dakota or to any political boss in North Dakota. Everything I do will be done in the interest of the rank and file of the people of North Dakota and, likewise, in the interest of the entire Nation. If the time ever comes when I

cannot do that, Mr. President, I will hand in my resignation, and will walk out of this Chamber with my head up and my chest out, knowing that I have never violated my oath of office and never have made a deal or done anything else which would in any way reflect upon the honor and integrity either of myself or of any other Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Senate for having taken this much time, during the closing hours of the session; but I believe that such a dirty, filthy, despicable attack upon a Member of the United States Senate and upon the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and upon the Senate itself should not go unchallenged or unanswered.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am sure every Member of the Senate commends the eminent senior Senator from North Dakota for the remarks he has made on a question of personal privilege, and for presenting in so detailed a way the most devastating defense and refutation of unfounded and biased charges that it has ever been my privilege to hear. I desire to thank the Senator from North Dakota for doing it.

COAL AND ITS IMPORTANCE TO THE NATION

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, modern progress and our expanding economy have resulted in many profound changes affecting our natural resources. Among these is coal. The great coalfields of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio are having serious economic difficulties. Coal has been heavily replaced by gas and oil. Regardless of this, coal is still a most vital element in the American economy.

We do not want a governmental subsidy for coal, but everything possible should be done to aid this industry during these heavy declines in the use of coal.

The Government can help at the local, State, and Federal levels by more favorable tax laws.

The present importation of oil in great quantities should be given the most careful scrutiny by our Government.

There should also be governmental studies toward reducing the objection to the use of coal as a household fuel because of smoke and ashes.

If the time should come when we are cut off from other parts of the world, it will be necessary for us to depend upon coal. The Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph recently published a very fine editorial on the subject of coal. The editorial is entitled "Old King Coal," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLD KING COAL

The great Pennsylvania coalfields, once a beehive of wealth, are in serious economic difficulties.

There have been heavy declines in production, both in the bituminous areas of western Pennsylvania and in the anthracite district in the northeast.

The markets for coal have been narrowing.

The competing fuels—gas and oil, smokeless and ash free—have taken over most of the domestic heating market.

The railroads have scrapped their steam locomotives and gone to diesel power.

There must be something tragic to the men of the mines, both in management and labor, in the daily spectacle of trains of coal moving to the market behind diesel engines.

But that is the stern verdict of competition.

Coal, still one of the Nation's richest sources of energy and wealth, must step aside until more efficient means are found to unlock its potential power.

Coal remains a foundation stone of the Nation's economy. It was the principal source of power in two world wars. Until the atom is developed as a practical source of industrial energy, or until some new power source is found, coal will remain the Nation's fuel reserve.

But what happens in the meantime? If coal production is restricted to a point where numerous pits are closed, towns abandoned and miners move into other activities, King Coal will not be roused so easily from his slumbers.

If a new national emergency should arise that would block the ocean lanes to the heavily-laden tankers that now move unmolested upon the face of the seven seas, then the cry would echo for King Coal among the abandoned caverns of his realm.

The job of clearing those dripping slate-clogged entries quickly with partially untrained men would not be easy.

It is easy to blame this condition on someone—on the mine workers for forcing their wage scale to a point where they priced themselves out of the market, on management for failure to do a better planning and selling job, or on Government for lacking wisdom in its directives.

But the basic fact is that the coal industry is one of the great defense bastions of the Nation and must be preserved in good operating condition.

To do less is to trifle with disaster.

The Government subsidy method has been suggested but not too much faith is to be placed in it. Not after the mess it has made in agriculture.

The future for coal is much more likely to be determined by cooperative efforts to find new and more efficient uses for the product—in the world of chemistry.

Coal can be transformed through the miracles of science into almost any one of the combinations of carbon with the other elements.

It can be transformed into a liquid or a gas.

The gasification of coal in the Pittsburgh district has been studied.

It is time that the scientific advances in this field are applied by the business world if King Coal is to waken again to the blasts of the works whistle.

REGULATION ON TRADING IN COFFEE

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to point to the refusal of the House of Representatives to take any action on either of two bills which have been unanimously passed by the Senate. Both these bills have an identical purpose. That purpose is as simple as the English language can state it: To place trading in coffee under the regulations of the Commodity Exchange Authority.

It is a rare occurrence, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States has to pass two separate bills in order to achieve the same purpose, but it is an even rarer occurrence for the other

House to fail to take any action on either of them.

I believe it is completely unprecedented for the Senate to pass a House bill, after adding an amendment of its own, only to have the bill return to the House and lie on the Speakers' table, waiting to die at the end of the session. Yet this is what has happened.

In a nutshell these are the facts: In 1949 and 1950, a Senate subcommittee of which I was chairman, and which was established to investigate price spreads in foods and fibers, made an exhaustive study of coffee prices and the speculative rise of those prices to our consuming public in late 1949. It was evident to our subcommittee that manipulators dealing in futures on the coffee exchange were mulcting the American consumers out of hundreds of millions of dollars. We made our report to the Senate in August 1950, with recommendations for legislative and administrative remedies.

One of our recommendations was that the Commodity Exchange Act be amended so as to include coffee among the list of commodities subject to regulation under that act. I introduced proposed legislation to that effect, but it was not acted on.

Early last year I again introduced proposed legislation, S. 1386, having this purpose. Early this year the Senate unanimously passed that bill. It was messaged to the House and was referred to the House Agriculture Committee; but there it has rested until this day.

After waiting what seemed an adequate time for action by the House, I addressed to the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE, a letter urging that action be taken because of the reported prospect of still another gouge of the American consumer on top of those to which he had already been subjected. Chairman HOPE replied that his committee was very much involved with general farm legislation and did not know when it would reach Senate bill 1386. The House later passed the general farm bill; and weeks passed, but without action on Senate bill 1386.

Then the House passed another bill, H. R. 6435, designed to bring onions under the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act. When that bill was reported to the Senate by our Agriculture Committee, I offered to it an amendment to add the word "coffee," thus bringing both onions and coffee within the provisions of the act. This amendment was unanimously approved by the Senate. The bill was returned to the House, and there it has reposed since that time.

If there had ever been any doubt in anyone's mind that trading in coffee futures needed to be made subject to regulatory supervision by the Federal Government, such doubt must have been wholly dispelled by the report published on July 30, 1954, by the Federal Trade Commission.

I have before me a copy of that report, entitled "Federal Trade Commission, Economic Report of the Investigation of Coffee Prices, Summary and Conclusions, July 30, 1954."

In passing, Mr. President, let me note that on January 23, 1954, in a letter to

the Honorable James M. Mead, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, I urged that the Commission investigate the operation of the instrumentalities engaged in the importation and distribution of coffee in the United States and bring its valuable machinery into action for the purposes of aiding and protecting the American people from any unreasonable or unjustified burdens in connection with the great increases in coffee prices.

The report from the FTC shows that on January 26, 1954, the Commission adopted a resolution directing that a comprehensive investigation be undertaken with respect to the coffee industry.

The summary and conclusions of the report on this investigation are now before us. I call particular attention to that section of the report beginning on page 19, entitled "The New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange and the Coffee Price Spiral," and to the section beginning on page 28, "Exchange Operations." I defy anyone reading these sections to reach any other conclusion than that certain practices now permitted in this exchange must, without further delay, be corrected, and that the trading in coffee futures must, at this session of Congress, be placed under regulation by the Commodity Exchange Authority.

For example, on page 28 we find the following paragraph:

An examination of trading on the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange reveals many respects in which the behavior of the exchange fails to satisfy the standards required for a freely competitive and broadly based futures market. The total volume of trading in the market has been quite small, for the domestic and international coffee trade makes relatively little use of the market in carrying on their trade operations. Indeed, it may be said that the most consistent use of the market is by Brazilians, and that, except for the upward price movement whose pattern has just been described, the typical pattern of behavior by Brazilian accounts has been to take a long position in a distant future and transfer to a more distant future when that contract becomes a near future in order to profit by the rise in price as the distant futures approach maturity.

Further quoting, from page 29:

The New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange has permitted certain practices which are not conducive to a competitive, orderly, and serviceable futures market. Officials of the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange have opposed in hearings before the Congress attempts to place it under governmental regulation, asserting that the exchange's mechanism for self-regulation is adequate and renders Government regulation unnecessary. However, the Federal Trade Commission's investigation disclosed that the rules and regulations in some instances are loosely drawn, susceptible to abuses, and improperly policed.

I shall not read more of the report to the Senate. It is available to any Member. Suffice it to say that this investigation in 1954 confirms in every respect the investigation made by our Senate subcommittee 4½ years ago, and also furnishes additional up-to-date information to which of course we did not have access in 1949 or 1950.

But what has happened in the interim between the publication of our Senate Agriculture Committee report in August

1950 and the publication of the Federal Trade Commission report in July 1954? The American consuming public has been gouged, and gouged repeatedly, by a small, powerful group of gamblers, speculators, and manipulators, both here and abroad, in amounts so enormous as to stagger the imagination of even those of us who have grown accustomed to astronomical figures in our budgets or appropriations bills.

If American farmers, or indeed any other segment of American life, had received subsidies in the past 4 years comparable to the sums which have been extracted from the American consumer by the coffee racket, the newspapers would have treated it as a national scandal far overshadowing any of those that have received so much attention in recent years.

It is reliably estimated that consumption of coffee in the United States runs close to 3 billion pounds a year. When we figure what the rise of 1 cent per pound costs the American people, we have some appreciation of what manipulations bringing about price rises of 50 cents per pound or more have cost us.

Enough is enough, Mr. President. The Congress of the United States will stand charged with dereliction in its solemn duties if we allow this session to end without having taken at least the very minimum step necessary to prevent continued raids on our consumers to go unchecked.

No one is so foolish as to pretend that placing coffee trading under the Commodity Exchange Act is going to recoup the enormous losses caused by the coffee gamblers in the past 4 years or more. Nor does anyone claim that such action is sufficient to prevent repeated recurrence of these unconscionable raids. We cannot legislate here to control what happens abroad. But we can legislate here for what happens at home. That we have not done. That we must do. The Senate has acted, not once, but twice, in the present session. What are the American people going to ask Members of the House if that body refuses to take even this first step in the protection of their pocketbooks?

First. Mr. President, I wish to repeat certain recommendations: When the tax bill was before the Finance Committee of the Senate, I introduced an amendment to place a 30-percent tax on the capital gains of nonresident alien traders on our commodity exchanges, because I believed the Congress should not permit a continuation of the practice that has developed of allowing foreign speculators to use our exchanges for their own benefit without paying any tax to the United States Government on their gains. Unfortunately, the Finance Committee did not see fit to include this amendment in the bill. That step will apparently have to wait until a later time.

Second. But, Mr. President, the immediate step to take is final adoption of the bill placing coffee under the Commodity Exchange Act.

Third. In addition, I strongly urge that the Federal Trade Commission report to the Department of Justice for prosecution any violations of existing law which they may have discovered dur-

ing their investigation. We cannot recover the vast sums already taken from us by these gamblers, but we can see to it that those among them who have violated the law are tried, convicted, and punished to the full extent of the law.

Our 1950 report made a number of recommendations which, had they been acted upon, would in my opinion have made it impossible for the coffee gamblers to carry out the immensely profitable manipulation of coffee prices which they accomplished last December and January—and from which, I add, they are still profiting. Whether by traders or roasters or those who have any other function in the coffee business, enormous profits have been made from this latest raid, profits which are in addition to the earlier sums taken in the great speculative raid of 1949–50.

We have had enough, Mr. President. The American people have had enough. I earnestly hope that the leadership of the House will see fit to follow the lead taken by the Senate in this matter. Only a few days are left in the present session, but they are enough to afford the House ample time to pass one or the other of the two bills now pending there for putting coffee under Government regulation. Are they waiting for another round in the seemingly endless game of gouging the American consumer?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not correct that we are now proceeding in the morning hour with speeches limited to 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California, the majority leader, had made a prior statement to the effect that following a quorum call, the morning business would be in order. The quorum call has not been had.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his request for the quorum call and yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will withhold my request for the time being, and yield to the Senator from Indiana.

GREETINGS TO GERMAN LANDSMANNSCHAFT

Mr. JENNER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, a statement of congratulations to the Sudeten German Landsmannschaft on the occasion of its annual gathering at Munich.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JENNER ON OCCASION OF ANNUAL MEETING, SUDETEN GERMAN LANDSMANNSCHAFT, MUNICH, MAY 1954

It gives me great pleasure to send greetings to the Sudeten German Landsmannschaft on the occasion of their annual gathering.

In this world struggle between Communist materialism and the spiritual powers of men, you stand on the frontier. You have felt the full fury of Communist brutality. Your whole people were roused in the middle of the night and driven from their homes and their beloved homeland, with not much more than the clothes on their backs, and the few possessions they could carry in their hands.

Why did the Soviet leaders know that you must be driven from your homes, if the Soviet design for the postwar world was to prevail? The Soviet leaders knew that you belonged among those who opposed communism completely and clearly, with the full energies of your minds and your hearts, because you were dedicated to a spiritual ideal—a firm belief that men were not combinations of potassium, and sodium, and oxygen, to be weighed only by material tests. You knew the one thing needful—that human beings possess that little spark of spiritual energy which we call the soul.

The Communists are not afraid of people with lukewarm ideas about goodness, or freedom, or welfare. People with lukewarm ideas are putty in their hands. The Communists have learned to exploit every device of present-day psychological knowledge to manipulate men's minds. The only people the Communists fear are those with a firm belief in the innate dignity and spiritual value of man and in a universe guided by a Power greater than any human being.

How clever the Communists are to encourage and make use of the softheaded, while they fight incessantly to destroy those who hold an unbreakable conviction of devotion to what is right.

The Soviet leaders set up their schemes for the postwar world long before the war in Europe was ended. They needed a Europe that was either Communist or weak. They needed to push the Soviet borders as far westward as possible, to add to the vast distances which had destroyed the armies of Napoleon and of Hitler. They needed to set up weak, or docile, or confused governments in a wide area about their own borders—a political no man's land like the desolate stretches just behind their barbed-wire borders. They needed to move as close as possible to the Atlantic nations, so that every planned step in the war of nerves would strike directly against the western nations, who used to be cushioned against Communist pressures by the broad zone of Central Europe.

The Communists also needed non-Russian allies whose pro-Communist nationals could be sent to Western Europe and the United States, to infiltrate our anti-Communist agencies here and abroad and reduce American psychological warfare to impotence.

One precept guided all their tactics—kill or drive out the hard core of anti-Communists in Central Europe and we shall have no trouble taking over the rest.

The brutal determination with which after the war the Communist leaders insisted refugees from the Soviet Union must be sent back as deserters was cut from the same cloth as the expulsion of the Sudeten Germans. They knew if they could kill or drive out the men of firm principle, the soft-headed and the ambitious would do their work for them.

You were driven from your homes, but your spirit was not quenched. Even in exile you formed your own fighting organization. You made yourselves a force for anticommunism even when you had no homeland. And you helped all Europe and the United States by your brave refusal to permit Communist agents and their hirelings to get a foothold among the refugees.

It would be hazardous to make any concrete prophecies about what is ahead of us. But principles are timeless. The struggle between materialism and the world of spiritual values must go on until it is settled one

way or the other. Men cannot live half spiritual beings and half cringing slaves, ready, like Pavlov's dogs, to obey every conditioned reflex their masters have taught them.

I wish for you continuing success in your chosen task of reaffirming the ideals by which men must live, and in keeping your actions as a group dedicated to that higher moral purpose. I hope we shall all soon see the day when the people of Europe, of Russia, of Asia, of Africa, and of the Americas, can live happily in their own homelands, unafraid because they are one in their faith in things of the spirit.

THE FIFTH COLUMN MUST GO— ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNER

Mr. JENNER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the *Record* a speech made by me in Springfield, Ohio, on April 29, 1954.

This speech points out that the Communist organization can be understood only if we recognize the three types of which it is composed: First, the trained professional Communists; second, the dupes of Communist brainwashing propaganda; and third, the "collaborators," so-called Americans who do not believe in the Communist ideology but are willing to make deals with it for the sake of power, publicity, or financial gain.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

THE FIFTH COLUMN MUST GO

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to come here tonight to a neighbor State of my own State of Indiana, part of the happy valley where so much of American history has been made.

My work in Congress has brought me into close contact with the fine men whom the State of Ohio sends to Washington, to speak for its people on matters which concern the national interest.

One of Ohio's most distinguished sons, Robert Alonzo Taft, was a foremost spokesman in Congress in a time of doubt for the American ideals of devotion to liberty, to justice, and to the spirit of the law. He had a scholar's knowledge of the long and bitter struggles which brave men had waged against would-be tyrants, before these ideals could be made the keystone of a new form of government—American constitutional liberty. Senator Taft fought with all his intellect and courage against those who were trying to undermine that great achievement, even in the very Capital of our Nation.

Another Senator from your State, JOHN BRICKER, has carried on a valiant fight to preserve our heritage of liberty under law from erosion by endless waves of treaties and agreements, made in the secret recesses of the new bureaucracy, which operates free from the checks set up in our Constitution. Sixty Members of the United States Senate voted for Senator GEORGE's adaptation of the Bricker amendments to put treaty-made law back under the Constitution.

Your Representative from this district, CLARENCE BROWN, has had a career of great distinction in the House of Representatives. Much of his work has been in the Rules Committee, and there is no more powerful committee in the House of Representatives. There he has been concerned not so much with particular legislative battles but with the programing of the work of the House throughout the year. His chief contribution is not made in the public view, but in the daily grind of committee meetings. It is important, in enabling the House of Representatives to pick the best out of the mass of

legislative proposals which is dropped into the hopper every year.

Passing laws is, however, only a small part of our task. Tonight I want to speak about the investigating powers of Congress. Before we can pass laws, we must seek out whatever information we can find. It is also our duty to report that information to you, so that you will know what problems the country faces, and how we can best meet them. That thorough investigation of national problems is what congressional committees are set up to do.

Even in ordinary times the information gathered by congressional committees is of great importance. In times of crises the power of your representatives in Congress fully to explore any threat to our security may make the difference between survival and destruction.

The United States is engaged today in a world conflict unlike any struggle in past history. This conflict is in itself a series of wars. The fight is not over land hunger or rival dynasties or conflicting creeds. This conflict is to decide what kind of creatures human beings are to become. We believe human life has a meaning above the animal, that man has a spark we call the soul. From this spiritual quality comes the individual rights which we call liberty. Today, we face a foe who believes that man is a combination of chemicals to be cut or pounded like wood or stone, or "conditioned" like Pavlov's dogs to any bestial existence his master wishes to impose on him.

This cruel scourge, which we call communism for short, is not hemmed in behind fixed borders. It is pressing day and night to make sure that the people of our country, of this happy valley, shall live like Pavlov's dogs, trembling under the lash of Soviet animal trainers. Our enemy knows, what we hesitate to face, that the human race cannot exist half spiritual beings with their eyes lifted up in hope, and half whipped curs, with their eyes bent on the ground in despair.

The bloody borders of this world conflict are in Korea and Indochina and Germany. But the decisive battleground of that struggle lies right here in the heartland of North America.

I can make you this solemn promise—if the people of the United States see clearly the nature of the conflict that envelopes us, if we understand the strange new weapons of our foe, if we use our great strength in harmony with true American ideals, this conflict can be ended in a short while, with certain victory for those who believe in the higher nature of man.

Our only real danger is that true Americans may be drugged to sleep, by hypnotic words, while a strange breed of false Americans misuses our strength, for purposes helpful to our enemy.

Against this danger, your congressional committees are seeking to give you the vital information you need for any war. The investigating committees of Congress are your G-2 for the war on communism on our soil. Only with clear and full information can true Americans unite in a common determination that the fifth column must go. No Soviet agent, no Soviet dupe, and no false American low enough to collaborate with the Communists for gain, can have any office of trust in any public or private area of American life.

For 20 years House and Senate investigating committees have dug deep down into the records to bring out for the American people the full story of how the Communist world government sent its trained agents to the United States, and recruited embittered or foolish or power-mad Americans to serve the Soviet Government and help it destroy our country from within.

I will mention first the work of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, because I have served on it since it was established.

Under Senator PAT McCARRAN, of Nevada, this subcommittee made a dragnet investigation of the influence being brought to bear in shaping our fantastic State Department policy. We centered our investigation about the Institute of Pacific Relations, a private research agency. We had learned from the hearings on General MacArthur's dismissal that many of the men on the staff of the institute had been exceedingly active in recommending personnel and policies to our State Department during the period when it was turning pro-Soviet in a quiet, subtle, but strangely effective way.

The Internal Security investigation of the IPR brought out testimony under oath that Owen Lattimore and the IPR served from the mid-thirties on as a "cover shop" for Soviet military intelligence. Thus the Communist government could continue to collect information in China, although Chiang Kai-shek had banned it. Imagine Americans working for the Soviet MKVD or Soviet Military Intelligence, while the Soviet Union was purging its own founders in grim mockery of justice.

In 1953 and 1954, as chairman of the subcommittee, I continued the study of this strange interlocking subversion into many Government departments.

We also began an investigation of Communist penetration into our schools and colleges. We found in education the same pattern of interlocking subversion. Bright young men with Communist loyalties moved from the colleges to Government. Then when congressional investigations came too close, they were moved to jobs in the colleges, with all the prestige of well-paid Government service. Meanwhile, competent loyal American teachers watched the Communist apparatus move its darlings from low-paid teaching jobs to high-paid Government jobs and then back to the highest ranks of the teaching profession. Here the trained propaganda agents of the U. S. S. R. could write books and articles proving how right were our Government's pro-Communist policies.

The same sinister pattern of interlocking subversion appeared in our investigation of procommunism among the Americans on the U. N. staff. We found most of them were graduates of the interlocking subversion in our Government, hastily moved to an agency outside the scrutiny of Congress, when our investigating committees came too close.

Our subcommittee found another Communist pattern for our grade schools. When the Communist leaders were indicated, the party prepared to go underground. They devised a system of 3-man cells, but each of which was constantly starting new 3-man cells, in the schools. No one knew more than five people in the secret apparatus, but all of them were part of a vast secret Communist army moving with perfect discipline wherever the Communist leaders ordered them to go.

Some of you still hope that communism is a leftwing organization that appeals to radicals living near Union Square. That is a beautiful delusion. This secret apparatus of three-man cells was not devised to convert leftwingers. It was planned to spread like a cancer to every State and city and school in the United States.

We learned about this Communist underground in the schools, only by chance. Soviet agents in Hungary made a mistake and told the Cominform that John Lautner, a member of the Soviet Control Commission in the United States, was a traitor. Communist goon squads ordered Lautner to the basement of a house right in your city of Cleveland—in a neighborhood called Kingsbury Run. There, plug-uglies beat him up with guns and butcher knives. They told him to come back the next morning at 11 o'clock for another beating. He came. Such is Soviet discipline. John Lautner appeared, but the goon squads did not. While he was

waiting for his beating up, Lautner began to wonder why he stayed in the Communist conspiracy. He decided to break. That is the only reason we know about this secret triangular underground in the schools. Otherwise it would be there but we would not know about it. Don't make any mistake. It would not be far away but right here trying to get into your school system.

Our subcommittee heard Bella Dodd tell how the Communists trained the college generation of students to become keen ingenious leaders in the war for a Soviet America, but they did something quite different with the grade schools. They believed that by the time those younger students were graduated we would be a Sovietized America. Therefore, they tried to give the little children the soft puttylike education they would need as helots in a communized American province of the world Soviet Union.

I have barely touched the edges of the vast river of information about the Communist fifth column, including the superb work done in the House of Representatives under both Democrats and Republicans.

Do you see why Congress works so hard through its committees to be your G-2 in this secret war? Do you see why the Communists and their dupes want congressional committees to fight with powder puffs and investigate with tooth picks?

I want tonight to give you the true proportions of this thing. You remember the curious decisions made by Secretary Acheson and General Marshall while China was in a death struggle with Communists armed by Red Russia.

Do not imagine that was something far off that concerns only the Chinese. Let me repeat. That is not something far away which concerns only the Chinese. If our own Government had not adopted a China policy beneficial to Soviet Russia and disastrous for us, where would we be today? The United States would today have a chain of airbases facing Siberia, a few miles from the Soviet border, from Vladivostok on the Pacific to Novosibirsk in mid-Siberia, and perhaps even to Magnitogorsk in the Urals. Korea would not be ruins. Americans would not lie beneath heaps of Korean dust, or in nameless graves in Manchuria. Submarine bases on the China coast would be in the hands of our friends. And tens of billions of taxes would not have been collected from our overburdened people, leaving our mountainous debt higher than ever before.

We cannot comprehend what is uncovered by these congressional investigations unless we see the whole problem.

I want tonight to lay down a few propositions which it is essential to consider in any attempt to wrestle with the Communist attack on our country.

First of all, we must understand that we are not dealing with individual Communists or their dupes. We are dealing with the fifth column, and the fifth column is an army. Every man or woman in this country who follows Soviet orders is an officer in a secret Soviet army, operating on American soil, to one supreme purpose—to conquer inch by inch, or mile by mile, or agency by agency, every sector of American national life and make it subordinate to Soviet rule. Every official, every politician, every writer, every teacher, every scientist, every union leader, and every businessman, who works under Communist guidance, whether he has a party card or not, is an officer in a Soviet army secretly invading our country to bring about our destruction.

This characterization applies to Communist agents, whether party members or not. It applies to all Communist collaborators who have made a deal with the Soviet apparatus in return for money or votes, or office, or prestige. The dupes who unwittingly carry the deadly germs of Communist propaganda serve the Soviet Union as

truly as army cooks who would put poison in the company's soup because someone told them it was a strange new flavor.

The Communists are at war against us. Their war plans include the use of collaborators and of dupes. In wartime we cannot tolerate innocents who carry messages for the enemy, or who plant deadly mines, because someone told them the little boxes would grow hyacinth bulbs. The gravediggers of America are not the card-carrying leftwing Communists or their dupes, but the collaborators—the politicians, the businessmen, the lawyers, the Government officials, the writers, who made the deals the Communists needed to build up power.

An army is more than individuals. We are not fighting individuals in this war on communism. If American soldiers shot down a German sniper in France or a Japanese sniper in New Guinea, they would not think they had defeated the enemy. They would know that, in an army, when an individual falls, another individual takes his place. Individual Communists may fall out but their place is never vacant. The army never rests or sleeps.

Let us never forget. The Soviet fifth column is a secret army engaged in continuous advance along every avenue leading to every sector of American life. It was moving into our Government on a small scale in the early thirties, on a larger scale after 1936, in a mass movement in war and postwar policymaking. The fifth column is moving into the press, radio, movies, television, the schools, the colleges, the publishers, the women's clubs, the foundations, the unions, business and the banks, and businessmen's organizations. There is only one answer to the question: Where is the Soviet fifth column operating? The answer is "everywhere."

The Soviet fifth column is not only advancing along every road, but all parts of the advancing armies are coordinated. When the Communists placed an agent in a government department, they immediately worked to get a Communist or a collaborator at every point from which anti-Communists might get him out.

When they placed pro-Communists in key government departments dealing with foreign policy, they were busy placing pro-Communists in key places in newspapers, on the radio, and in our great magazines. They were directing a flow of articles out to all parts of the country saying the Chinese Reds were agrarian reformers, that is, good American populists, much like William Jennings Bryan, who had no use for Stalin. The fifth column put its agents or dupes in the publishers' offices to see that a rash of cheap trivial books on China was constantly coming off the presses with the same story, while distinguished China scholars could not get their works published. The Communists moved their people into the foundations, so they could direct American money to their kind of writers. They moved into the book review journals, so they could give their stooges friendly reviews, and damn with faint praise the old-fashioned Americans who would not kow-tow to the intellectual bandits.

I have not even touched on Germany but the China story can be duplicated step by step from the records of our German policy.

If all the facts gathered by all of the congressional investigations could all be laid before you, they would give you only a glimpse of the area covered by the fifth column in the United States. That is the most important fact of all.

All our investigations together have caught only a few stragglers, a few men who slipped, like Hiss or Marzani. But for one Lattimore whose story we uncovered, there are many other Lattimores, whom we have not uncovered. For one Harry D. White whom we know, there are a thousand whom we cannot

even name. We know Alger Hiss, only because he happened to be known to a man who left the Communist conspiracy, but remember we have had no new Whittaker Chambers in 15 years. There are 10,000 Alger Hisses who are known to men who dare not leave.

To say that there were only 8 Communists in a big government department, because we can find only 8, is as if the Indian scouts in the West came back with reports there were only 2 Sioux or 2 Apaches in a valley, because they caught only 2 stragglers.

We do not need to know the names of the Communists in government or in the press or in high finance, to fight them. Our Army did not need to know the names of the Indian braves, if they could see the smoke of their camp fires, or felt the arrow in their back.

It is incredible stupidity to assume there are no Communists in government today because Harry White died several years ago and Harold Glasser was allowed peacefully to resign his high-paid job. Do you believe the Soviet fifth column quit in 1948, because White and Glasser had been uncovered? Does an army quit because two men are lost? No, the Communist high command merely redoubled its intimidation of pro-Communists who might be ready to break. All we can say with truth is that we have had almost no recruits from the inner circle of communism in the last few years. That means it is our intelligence from ex-Communist sources which declines about 1948—not the Communist attack itself.

The FBI has continued its magnificent work, but its information is for the President and the Attorney General. Furthermore, the FBI deals with crimes, like espionage and sabotage. But most of the grave-diggers of America have committed no crime. How can Congress prevent the Communist fifth column from softening or weakening or slanting or confusing our military and foreign policies except by exposure? How otherwise can we stop the interlocking subversion of Communists in our Government with the fifth column in foreign countries, which gave us Teheran and Yalta and Potsdam?

Communists in the Government of France weakened and blurred and confused French military and foreign policy, just before France was invaded by their allies, the Nazis. Do you think the Communists who softened up France before 1939 have stopped all efforts to soften up and disorganize France today? How much influence do they wield at Geneva at this moment?

Spruille Braden, Assistant Secretary of State in the previous administration, says the same influences are at work in our State Department today as in Hiss's day. The Communists penetrated the American State Department at least 20 years ago. They have been using the techniques of collaboration with the venal, intimidation of the patriotic, and brainwashing of the innocent, through all that time, with full freedom of opportunity. What would you expect after 20 years?

The Communist fifth column has been at work everywhere in this country in high gear for over 20 years. It has had collaborators reaching to the very top positions in public and private life. It has consistently advanced the proletarians, forced good Americans who opposed it into professional exile. With its great psychological insight, and influence over all branches of communication, it has kept up a brainwashing operation on the innocents who occupy what they call the middle of the road.

It is time in this country for a John Paul Jones, who will rise up and say, "We haven't begun to fight yet."

It is time for good Americans to put aside all softness, all dishonest liberalism, and take their places in this war for survival.

Let us say with one voice, the fifth column must go.

The fifth column in the United States is the same kind of men, working by the same methods, under the same high command, as the men who tortured our fighting men in Korea. They are working to the same end—the destruction of the United States.

How can we talk of driving the Communists out of Indochina if we cannot drive them out of all levels of our government and our public opinion agencies?

There is no place anywhere in American life for agents of the Soviet Union. There is no place anywhere in American life for anyone who has ever collaborated with the Soviet fifth column for gain—whether it was Soviet gold, Communist votes, political office, fat business contracts, or moving-picture credits. There is no place even for innocents who scattered the Soviet word mines because the Soviet agents say they aren't loaded.

Let us start now to clean house. Let us, each of us, who has had no truck with communism, enlist himself as a one-man or one-woman army, to force every Communist and collaborator from every office or position of trust in public or private life in the United States.

If they are foreigners, let us send them home. If they are American citizens, let us deprive them of the rights they despise. Let them earn their living as dishwashers or ditch diggers, but not in places where they can poison our minds.

Let us cut off all contact with the fountainhead of pollution, the Soviet Union Government, and with the countries under its iron heel. Let us head the Communist governments off, where they can damage only themselves. Let us close the iron ring around them, keep our people and our goods outside, help their own mistreated people to escape, and wait for this parasite state to fall apart.

In all the world there is only one major source for the trouble and danger and worry that afflicts us all. All the fear spread by the hydrogen bomb will disappear the day the Soviet Government falls. Their evil army can work only behind its smokescreen of secrecy, lies, smears, confusion, and double-talk. If Americans are not confused by their lies, the Communists cannot win.

Let us face the one essential fact. The fifth column—the Soviet Union's secret army—is the only weapon the Soviet Union can successfully use against us. Does any true American bid us delay?

Let us use our strength, as we have used it in the past, to help other nations, but let us set up one condition—if they drive the fifth column from their own soil. Deprived of its chance to suck nourishment from the free world, through the tentacles of its fifth columns, the Soviet Union will wither and shrink, until its captive people can rise up as one man, destroy their oppressors, and end the nightmare that afflicts the world.

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNER

Mr. JENNER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, a speech made by me in St. Paul, Minn., on February 8, 1954, before the Lincoln Republican Club.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Once a year, near the birth date of Abraham Lincoln, we Republicans forget the daily grind of politics and lift our eyes like Lincoln to the vision of what our country has done and what we hope it will do.

Every year we are refreshed and inspired by this renewal of our faith, but 1954 is a year for special pride and hope.

It is just 100 years since a few Americans, living in the Middle West, decided they could not accept the verdict of both older parties, that they would tinker with trivialities, while the survival of our Federal Union was in doubt.

Who would have dreamed that the little group of men and women who assembled at Jackson, Mich., on July 6, 1854, would exercise a predominant influence over the next century, and, we hope, over generations to come? Those unknown, unimportant people, meeting to act on their convictions, had only one asset. In the midst of confusion and bitterness and double talk, they could recognize the most important issue of their time. They could recognize it clearly because they had the courage to face whatever they might see. There can be no clear thinking where there is no courage.

The Lincoln Day celebrations of 1954 are memorable for another reason. Today we Republicans face a political situation as hazardous as that of 1854. The confusion and the bitterness are as marked, and as portentous of danger. But, if we have courage, like the Republicans of 1854, we can lead a new American Revolution, as memorable as that of 1854, or of 1776. We too can make a clean break with the unhappy past, and venture into a future stranger than anything even the pioneers had to face.

Our country is on the threshold of great changes, and great changes mean great opportunities, for good or evil.

The Republican Party has been entrusted, by the people of both parties, with the work of guiding the ship of state on a new and happier voyage. It has a mandate to lead our country out of the despair and illusion, the false hope and bloody awakening, which have been our portion for 20 years.

Today we do honor to Lincoln and our other great Republican pioneers, but in 1954 we must do more than honor them. We must imitate them.

For 20 years our beloved country has been governed by an invading army of alien intellectuals. Their ideas were foreign to every principle that has moved our people since the days, four centuries ago, when Englishmen clustered in their villages and talked of the tyranny of kings, when they decided that the harsh fate of exiles was better far than the bitter taste of submission.

For 20 years this Government of alien-minded planners has plundered our country of its resources. It has debilitated our people with promises of canned welfare, fed to them on an assembly line.

This alien government has wasted the good will our forefathers earned abroad in a century and a half of just and courteous treatment of other nations. It has even tampered with the security of the United States and permitted traitors to bring us close to military defeat.

That long nightmare is now over. Fellow Republicans, in 1952 we liberated our country from the enemy as truly as ever a rescuing army liberated its homeland from enemy troops.

From July 1950, when Fair Deal lies and double dealing reached their inevitable climax in the Korean war, we kept up an unceasing struggle against our betrayers, until the victory of November 1952 removed them from the high places in our Government.

I tell you now, my friends, that it was impossible for a political party, with only voluntary gifts and volunteer workers, to unseat the Fair Dealers who had the power to tax us to the quick. They used our money to send an army of propagandists and fixers into every State in the Union, to bribe our people or intimidate them, to vote as the officeholders wished.

I said it was impossible to unseat the Fair Dealers, and I meant it was impossible. How

then did the Republican Party, 20 years out of public office, achieve this victory? We defeated this Fair Deal because of a political miracle. Our country owes a great political debt to the young men who left their homes and went half way round the world in the uniform of our country. They fought as bravely as Americans ever fought, but the gains won by their sacrifices were tossed away by the Achesons and their friends. The United States of America, with the greatest moral strength, the greatest industrial strength, and the most powerful armed force of any nation, deferred to Red China, a bandit government. We obligingly fought the war on the soil of our friends, leaving the railroads, the airports, and the harbors of the enemy safe from harm.

The United States of America, with the greatest moral strength, the greatest industrial strength, and the most powerful armed force of any nation, asked for an armistice at the moment of victory, because Acheson planned it that way. And whom did we ask for an armistice? We asked a desolated province of Korea, a former colony of Japan. We asked the bandit government of Red China. Our officers had to sit down at the conference table with Red bandits, and quibble over an armistice, while Americans were being killed by Reds who had friends high in our Government.

Our fighting men could not speak for themselves, my friends. But their sacrifice was more than honest men could endure. It will long be the greatest pride of the Republican Party that we spoke for them.

The noble voice of Herbert Hoover was lifted in their behalf. The powerful voice of General MacArthur warned the people that American fighting men must not be subject to civilian leaders who were trading with the enemy, not for the little profits of commerce, but for political power.

In the Senate, our well-loved colleague, Robert A. Taft, worked day and night to learn the hidden facts and tell the story to our people. Republicans like Senator McCARTHY, Senator BRIDGES, Senator KNOWLAND, Senator BRICKER, and others, would take no rest until every last American learned that new Benedict Arnolds were betraying our military security under cover of State Department gobbledegook. Your own Congressman WALTER JUD won a national reputation for his unceasing efforts to prevent the betrayal of China and Korea and the sacrifice of American blood in vain.

The Republicans did not unseat the Fair Deal unaided. It is credit enough that we began the fight, and that, hopeless though it seemed, we never let go, until Americans of both parties rallied to the cause, and decided the struggle.

I want to pay tribute to Democrats like Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, who with judicial impartiality brought out all the facts relating to MacArthur's dismissal, without once asking whether his party's interests might suffer. I want to pay tribute to Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, who, with the highest standards of judicial impartiality, dug deep into the record of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and documented the shameful story of interlocking subversion from our State Department, the White House Secretariat, and the United Nations, through the IPR, to the Soviet military intelligence and the dreaded Soviet secret police.

We owe much to the fighting press, to individual writers, to loyal men and women, who gave their time and strength to bring out the evil story the Fair Dealers were trying desperately to hide.

No generation ever fought harder to unseat false leaders than we did. We fought so hard that, when victory came, we were too weary to know how much we had won. The struggle was followed by a kind of shell-shock. We could hardly think or feel. We needed time for healing.

That healing, President Eisenhower's calm, quiet, efficient administration is now giving us. After a long interval, our Federal Government is distinguished by good manners, official dignity, and mutual respect among true Americans, regardless of differences of opinion. I rate that return to dignity and quiet a very important step in the new Republican administration. Violence, name-calling, denunciation of opponents, and manufactured crises, are the instruments of dictators, or would-be dictators. They were used to keep our people diverted, confused, and unaware, while the inner circle decided what our Government should do in the name of America.

I have no patience with people who say the Republican Party has accomplished little or nothing in its first year in office. We expect Fair Deal columnists to make such statements but Republicans know better.

Never has a political party inherited such a mess. In the campaign, we spoke bravely of cleaning up the mess in Washington. We compared it with a housekeeper sweeping out an untidy room. Today we know better but how much we had to learn.

Everywhere we looked, where the American Government used to have orderly procedures, strict accounting, obedience to law, we found waste, corruption, confusion, and chaos. We also found dark places where the masters of chaos sat and directed the performance.

We talked in the campaign of balancing the budget. But how much we had to learn. We knew the Fair Deal had spent billions of dollars they did not have. Soon we learned we had to meet current payments on a hundred billion dollar charge account that had not even been billed.

We knew the New Deal-Fair Deal left us a bureaucracy of two and a half million men and women, directed by an inner clique with strangely un-American ideas. But how much we still had to learn. We did not know that, when the new Republican administration ordered reductions in force, unscrupulous officials would lay off the few Republicans in Government. We did not know the most ardent Fair Dealers would disguise themselves as nonpolitical experts, and make places for themselves in a civil-service system whose standards they never intended to observe.

Now, when we talk about the New Deal-Fair Deal bureaucracy, we know what that really means. It means that we have in our Government, still in important positions, a self-directed bureaucracy, answerable to neither the voters, their elected officials, nor the Republican or Democratic Parties.

The most vital achievement of President Eisenhower's first year is the complete redirection of our military policy. We knew that vast sums had been spent by the military. We knew our potential enemies were quite undisturbed, while the anxiety of our people was increasing daily. But how much we had to learn.

Today we know for certain what we long suspected, that the Fair Dealers never had a clear-cut strategic plan for our military safety. They had what I call an accordion defense, with spending now up, now down, with wars now hot, now cold.

This Fair Deal defense plan was perfectly calculated to drain vast resources, while giving no military security in return. Just think for a minute what it means to tank factories and airplane factories, which must tool their plants for operation months and years ahead, to have a jiggy, up-and-down schedule for production of their biggest and most complex products.

Perhaps you will wonder, as I do, just where this double-edged plan really originated. Are there other Harry D. Whites still hidden from our view? Certainly nothing could have served better the plans of Soviet Russia than putting a heavy strain on our economy, to get only confusion in return.

Quietly, without name calling or boasting, President Eisenhower has removed the Joint Chiefs of Staff who let central Asia fall to the Communists, and lost air bases a few miles from Siberia's industrial cities. He has replaced them with some of the ablest strategists in the world today.

Quietly, without name calling or boasting, he has freed the military from the role of lackey to the foreign-policy planners, which Harry Hopkins and Dean Acheson had forced upon them. Today the military are free to make plans that are best for the Nation's security. They do not have to make military plans to suit the ideology of Acheson's State Department.

We talked of communism in 1952, but how much we had to learn. Several years ago, the House Committee on Un-American Activities opened up the stories told by Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers, of the men in our Government who fed them material when they were couriers for Soviet espionage. We learned of Alger Hiss and Harry D. White. We learned of FBI reports which were started on their way to the White House and the Cabinet officials. But we could not prove whether they had arrived or whether pro-Communist assistants had side-tracked them.

Now we know where the bodies are buried. We know that the FBI in 1946 sent complete reports on Harry D. White to the President and his Cabinet officials giving in detail White's many connections with Soviet espionage and conspiracy. We know much, much more. We know from Gen. Harry Vaughn that the reports were received at the White House, and sent directly to President Truman. We know they reached Secretary of State Byrnes. We know they reached Secretary of the Treasury Vinson, and we know they reached Attorney General Tom Clark, because the Assistant Attorney General, Lamar Caudle, thought the reports so shocking he sent word about them to Tom Clark, though Clark was in the hospital.

We know further that Secretary Byrnes and Secretary Vinson and Assistant Attorney General Caudle were deeply disturbed. Vinson said Mr. Truman was deeply disturbed.

Only one thing we do not know—who was the man so powerful that he could reach President Truman quickly, and persuade him that the promotion of Harry D. White, collaborator with a Soviet espionage ring, should go through? We do not know.

What is this mysterious individual doing today? We do not know.

Is he still trying to promote Communist planners and espionage agents? Is he trying to prevent the President and Congress from uprooting other subversives? Is he blocking us when we try to undo the policies these Soviet sympathizers grafted onto our wartime Government? We do not know.

How many Communists are still in our Government, or in that governing circle which includes the great "experts" who give advice to government? How many trained officers of the Soviet political army are still engaged in sabotage more deadly than any dynamite or TNT could ever cause?

Today our people have the assurance that President Eisenhower has appointed an Attorney General who intends to enforce the laws against communism. We can rest secure knowing that Attorney General Brownell will give full support, not constant interference, to J. Edgar Hoover.

The Communist conspiracy is not yet uncovered. Harry D. White is dead, but is his story dead? Is it "warmed over spy" or today's headlines? Harry D. White helped put Eastern Germany under Soviet control. Leaders of the three Western Powers have been sitting meekly in Berlin, begging for kind words about East Germany from Molotov. Harry Hopkins is dead, but today the designs and atomic materials he sent to the Soviet Union have grown into, we don't know how many, atomic weapons stockpiled in

Manchuria, to be hurled at any moment on Korea or Indochina or even our own country.

Are these stories "warmed over spy" or are they today's headlines, or perhaps tomorrow's casualty lists? We in Congress intend to find out.

Never has a political party, newly come to power, found such heaps of evidence of the stupidity, the corruption, even the treason, of its predecessors.

But for once a political party is not going to use this evidence to win a party victory. It is a sad and solemn thing, my friends, to sit in the Internal Security Subcommittee, and hear witnesses tell the details of the betrayal of our country.

We in Congress will go forward with all our investigations into communism and corruption and extravagance. We shall complete the story of how the Communists in our Government threw away the victory of 1945, how they got us into an unnecessary war half way around the earth, how they made us lose that war after our fighting men had won it. We will show how they made a blueprint for our destruction, and carried it out according to their timetable, almost—but not quite—to the bitter end. We shall bring out this whole story judicially, impartially, as carefully as if we were in a court of law.

We shall not charge the Democratic Party with this betrayal, my friends. Real Democrats have no party. Their party was stolen from them right under their noses, by the clever insiders who wanted to stay permanently in power. By 1944 there was nothing left of the national Democratic Party at all. The New Dealers, the Fair Dealers, the PAC'ers, the Communists, had taken over, and were running a race to see who could drive the country to perdition first.

We do not have to blame the Democrats, my friends. As the story unfolds they will blame themselves more than we can ever blame them.

This is not a story of party failure. It is a story of treason, and real Democrats are as patriotic as we are.

We shall put the blame where it belongs, on the Fair Deal cabal which took over the Democratic Party, lock, stock, and barrel, in 1948.

We shall say only one thing of the Fair Dealers: "They opened the gates of the citadel to the Communists."

Communists were clinging to the outer fringes of our Government in 1933. But they would never have entered the inner temple without help from the Benedict Arnolds who opened the gates to them. We shall leave the refugees from the real Democratic Party to choose—do they want to follow the New Dealers, who let the Communists into the citadel, or do they want to come with us until the Democratic Party is reborn?

Someday I hope there will be a real Democratic Party, because I believe in the two-party system. I hope the Democrats will cut every vestige of the New Deal and Fair Deal out of their party. But the New Deal-Fair Deal dug its talons deep into the Democratic Party. It will take years before the injured body of that party is strong again.

We Republicans will go forward to our real task. We start, as the Republicans started a hundred years ago, with one sure touchstone. We shall solve a thousand practical problems with one clear purpose—to restore in its full strength, the American system of liberty under God, resting in law on the American Constitution.

I do not say the Republican Party will save our country. I say they have the opportunity to do so. We may succeed or we may fail, but the responsibility falls on us.

Last year, I said, was the year of healing, of recovery from too great a strain. This year can be the year of new beginnings, for our party and through us for our country.

Today I hope and trust that the Republican Party is going to give back to the American people the right to be let alone, the right to make a living, to keep their own earnings, and to pursue their own happiness in their own way, except when their country is in danger.

Your party in Congress and in the executive branch, having freed the people from heavy taxation and bureaucratic regimentation, can then turn its attention to the first duty of your Government. We shall eradicate from our foreign relations every last vestige of the people and the policies left by Dean Acheson, Harry Hopkins, Alger Hiss, and Harry D. White. We shall turn again to the great and enduring principles of policy that distinguished our foreign affairs from George Washington to John Hay. We shall make our own country strong and great. We shall be good neighbors to all other nations which truly love liberty.

We shall look to the past but we shall not turn back—Americans never turn back. We shall follow the pole star of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. We know our pole star will lead our ship of state safely on our way forward.

This is the Republican revolution, my friends. The opportunity is there. I pray God we may, like Lincoln, be worthy of it.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Green	Martin
Barrett	Hayden	Maybank
Beall	Hendrickson	McCarran
Bennett	Hennings	McCarthy
Bridges	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Bush	Hill	Millikin
Butler	Holland	Monroney
Carlson	Humphrey	Morse
Case	Ives	Mundt
Chavez	Jackson	Murray
Clements	Jenner	Payne
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Potter
Crippa	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Daniel	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Dirksen	Kefauver	Russell
Douglas	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Duff	Kerr	Schoeppel
Dworshak	Kilgore	Smathers
Ellender	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Ervin	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Langer	Stennis
Frear	Lehman	Symington
Fulbright	Lennon	Thye
George	Long	Watkins
Gillette	Magnuson	Wiley
Goldwater	Malone	Williams
Gore	Mansfield	Young

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. BOWRING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that under the prior order of the Senate we shall now have a morning hour under the usual 2-minute limitation, before the unfinished business is laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

PROCEDURE OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES— RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF MICHIGAN, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Michigan, Grand Rapids, Mich., on July 25, 1954, relating to the work of congressional investigating committees regarding the ferreting out of Red spies and saboteurs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American public has recently been alerted to the Red danger throughout our land; and

Whereas many patriotic employees of congressional committees have been attacked by subversive elements and misguided officials who have fallen victims to the communistic line of attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Michigan, in convention assembled in Grand Rapids, Mich., this 25th day of July 1954, move a vote of thanks to those members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other employees of the three congressional investigating committees for the services rendered their country in the ferreting out of Red spies and saboteurs in our industries and Government units that have affected the security of the national defense of our country; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend patriotic American officials who have fought to rid the country of those seeking its change or overthrow; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to chairman of the Committees on Un-American Activities and request that it be spread upon the journals of both the Senate and House of Representatives at Washington, D. C.; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge our Federal officials to carry out the objectives of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That we move a vote of thanks to the active working members of the three congressional investigating committees, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other employees of the three congressional investigating committees for the services rendered their country in the ferreting out of Red spies and subversives from our industries and governmental units, all in the interest of our national security, and that the work of the three committees be continued.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with an amendment:

S. 3851. A bill to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal

manufacture or acquisition in the United States, of special nuclear material and atomic weapons (Rept. No. 2488).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 3869. A bill for the relief of Kiji Tomi-naga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 3870. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

OFFICIAL SEAL OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and myself, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 314), as follows:

Resolved, That the President pro tempore of the Senate is authorized to adopt and use an official seal of his office.

SEC. 2. Expenses incident to the designing and procurement of such seal shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.

SEC. 3. A description and illustration of the seal adopted pursuant to this resolution shall be transmitted to the General Services Administration for publication in the Federal Register.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. My understanding is that the original resolution provided for a seal for both the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 314) was considered and agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SENATE KITCHENS AND RESTAURANTS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 315), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That a special committee composed of five Senators of whom not more than three shall be from the same political party, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the operation of the Senate kitchens and restaurants in the Capitol and Senate Office Building for the purpose of ascertaining whether such kitchens and restaurants are being operated in a manner which best serves the needs of the Senate and its employees, and particularly (1) whether the quality of the food and service are commensurate with prices charged, (2) whether proper standards of cleanliness and sanitation are ob-

served, and (3) whether the costs to the Senate of such operation or the profits accruing to the operation of such kitchens and restaurants as a result of such operation are excessive, (4) whether the facilities for such operation are adequate, and (5) what changes should be made in methods or manner of operation for the purpose of improving efficiency, service, the quality of food served, and facilities for such operation. The committee shall report to the Senate on or before February 15, 1955, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable. Upon the filing of its report, the committee shall cease to exist.

SEC. 2. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Statement by him, together with text of Senate Joint Resolution 174, and editorial comment, all in regard to the need for termination of deficit financing.

BUTLER-TOLLEFSON CARGO-PREFERENCE BILL

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a release by the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., under date of August 12, 1954.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 12, 1954.—Walter E. Maloney, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, today applauded the action of the House of Representatives in passing S. 3233, the Butler-Tollefson cargo-preference bill, frequently called the permanent 50-50 bill. The House action today was by unanimous consent following the unanimous recommendation of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. This bill had previously been unanimously passed by the Senate on June 15, 1954. Today's version is substantially identical with the bill as it passed the Senate and prompt Senate approval is expected.

Mr. Maloney said: "The American Nation and the American-flag merchant marine which is its fourth arm of defense and first arm of international commerce pay tribute to the foresight and constructive leadership displayed by Senator BUTLER, of Maryland, Congressman TOLLEFSON, of Washington, and the congressional leadership of both parties in the Congress in thus giving practical application to the long-standing shipping policy of our Nation that a substantial portion

of our foreign commerce should be carried in American-flag vessels, built in America, manned by American citizens and owned and operated by Americans."

He added: "This legislation represents no more than a practical recognition by the Congress that previous temporary statutes for the same and similar purposes should be made a permanent and integral part of the statutory framework of our Nation, designed to assure that American-flag shipping will continue to be ready in the future as it has in the past, to serve our Nation in both peace and war."

PRESS COMMENTS ON TESTIMONY OF GEN. MARK CLARK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, earlier this week Gen. Mark Clark appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and gave some very pertinent and revealing and worthwhile testimony. Subsequently, what General Clark said was rather severely twisted in certain press reports, and thereafter it was made to appear that some very prominent people had an erroneous idea of what General Clark had said.

In the Washington Star of Friday, Mr. David Lawrence, in his column, makes some comments on this situation which are so cogent that I ask unanimous consent that this particular portion of Mr. Lawrence's column may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Presidential press conferences are getting no better—in fact, they are doing increased harm not only to the President and the Republican Party but also to the influence abroad of the foreign policies of the United States.

Unfortunately much of the damage is done because sometimes the President isn't told the full story behind the questions fired at him.

Thus this week General Eisenhower was asked about recurrent suggestions that the United States sever diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia, and he was told that the most recent one came from Gen. Mark Clark. The fact was that the general was a witness before the Senate Rules Committee on other subjects, and Senator JENNER, of Indiana, chairman, read to him a resolution, introduced by himself and Senator McCARRAN, of Nevada, which would simply express the sense of the Senate that it would be desirable for the United States to sever diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and the satellite governments. General Clark was asked what he thought about it, and he replied briefly, that if he were a Member of the Senate, he would vote for it.

Now, General Eisenhower at his press conference was not told that fact nor was he told that a committee of nine Members of the House of Representatives, both Republicans and Democrats, had just filed a report unanimously recommending that the President convene an international conference to seek agreement with our allies on the severance of all diplomatic relations and the termination of all trade with the Communist countries. This committee has been taking testimony in Europe and elsewhere for several months from persons of prominence who have escaped from the Communist regime and who are in a position to tell Americans how influential such a policy would be in encouraging the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

But General Eisenhower, without going into the merits of this very difficult and

complicated question, rejected offhand any consideration of it. He said that if anyone would sit down and study the conflicting considerations objectively and not merely shoot from the hip on such questions, they would arrive at a similar conclusion.

But how do the nine members of the House committee who have spent many months on this problem feel? Have they been shooting from the hip, or has the President himself been doing that very thing because he has not been properly briefed on how the manifestation by him of a closed mind on this subject can bring discouragement to the enslaved peoples? Why did he have to discuss the question at all?

MISSOURI DROUGHT SITUATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 2 minutes concerning the drought program in the State of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes under the rule.

Mr. SYMINGTON. A letter dated August 10, addressed to the Missouri State Drought Committee, signed by the president of the Washington County Farm Bureau and 21 farmers from all areas of Washington County, Mo., presents most emphatically the need for the inclusion of Washington County among those in that area of Missouri designated for emergency drought assistance.

The statement made in the second paragraph of the letter, that the hay crop is only 88 percent of that of last year, pastures only 83 percent of last year, water supply 64 percent of last year, and corn crop only 10 percent of last year, again emphasizes the seriousness of conditions there.

From firsthand observation I know the extent of the drought in Washington County last year. Pastures then were so far gone that farmers in the area had chopped down the trees in the fields so that their starving cattle could eat the leaves for roughage.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter to which I have referred, together with the names of the signers, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Potosi, Mo., August 10, 1954.
MISSOURI STATE DROUGHT COMMITTEE,
Jefferson City, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: On this 10th day of August in a meeting assembled by the invitation of the Washington County Farm Bureau, representative farmers from all areas of the county met to discuss whys and wherefores that Washington County was left out of the drought disaster area.

A poll of those present showed hay 88 percent of last year, pasture 83 percent of last year, water 64 percent of last year, and corn 10 percent of last year.

Therefore be it respectfully resolved of the State drought committee take all immediate action necessary to have Washington County included in the drought disaster area.

Sincerely,

C. E. Newcomer, President; W. F. York, Liberty Township, Potosi, Mo.; A. M. Rieffer, Bellevue Township, Caledonia, Mo.; Norman A. Cole, Brenton, Township, Bonne Terre, Mo.; John Hovine, Richwood Township, Rich-

wood, Mo.; Chas. E. Drew, Bellevue Township, Caledonia, Mo.; Arthur E. Smith, Concord Township, Irondale, Mo.; Harry Riehl, Barton Township, Potosi, Mo.; Frank Wright, Bellevue Township, Caledonia, Mo.; Lloyd Crandall, Belgrade Township, Belgrade, Mo.; Bruce Miles, Kingston Township, Blackwell, Mo.; G. W. Stricker, Walton Township, Shirley, Mo.; A. H. Long, Union Township, Coder, Mo.; B. P. Bequette, Union Township, Cadet, Mo.; Jack Garrett, Union Township, Cadet, Mo.; T. L. Dace, Johnson Township, Anthonies Mill, Mo.; W. S. Nicholson, Britton Township, Potosi, Mo.; Carl Miller, Concord Township, Potosi, Mo.; Carl Bouse, Johnson Township, Anthonies Mill, Mo.; John Pillice, Belgrade Township, Belgrade, Mo.; L. L. Newcomer, Britton Township, Mineral Point, Mo.; Leroy J. Paul, Union Township, Cadet, Mo.

THE IDEA OF COMMUNISM—ARTICLE FROM THE COMMONWEAL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, one of the keenest analyses of the Communist problem which I have seen in print for a long time appears in the August 6, 1954, issue of *The Commonwealth*. I ask unanimous consent to have the article, which is entitled "The Idea of Communism," printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IDEA OF COMMUNISM

Communism is a three-way danger. It is, first of all, an idea that has won the allegiance of millions throughout the world. As an idea communism presents a more or less coherent philosophy of life and of man rooted in dialectic and historical materialism. Secondly, communism is a political conspiracy; as such it is an internal threat wherever it has followers to carry out party orders. Thirdly, communism is a worldwide military force embarked on a program of expansion and aggression.

The three aspects of communism go hand in hand. The idea comes first; the party is able to enlist from convinced ideologists followers ready to carry out subversion or, when the climate is right, to change social disorder and discontent into the coin of mass political action. This latter activity is hopeless in the United States at the present time, but such was not the case during the bleak depression years and in countries like Italy and France the unhappy social scene is still a fruitful vineyard for Communist apostles. In both these countries communism is able to command a large number of votes. The votes come not from convinced Communist ideologists but from dissatisfied people who take that way to express discontent with their lot.

The problem of fighting communism is to keep each of these three avenues of Communist approach closely guarded. It would not do, for instance, to concentrate so exclusively on counteracting communism as an idea that the avenue of internal subversion was ignored. It would not do to concentrate so completely on the problem of subversion as to ignore the military aspects. In this place or that, one or the other danger may be greater than the others, but the 3-way attack must be met by an alert 3-way defense.

Communism as an idea has probably been the most neglected of all three, both here and abroad. Both leftwing and rightwing opinion in the United States has been guilty of obscuring the real nature of communism as an idea. For years, with notable

exceptions, many patriotic liberal Americans neglected to take a good hard look at just what communism means in terms of ideas. The rude awakening that came after the war was really unnecessary. In the glow of the wartime alliance with Russia even stalwart generals were saying that the difference between communism and democracy was just about as crucial as the difference between American Democrats and Republicans. If the philosophy of communism had been seriously examined, we might have avoided many well-meant but disastrous moves. Too many Americans felt that communism was undoubtedly foreign and perhaps even on the screwball side, but were not yet sufficiently oriented to the ideological age to believe that the future of the world might actually be dependent on the abstruse dialectics found in dull, barely readable Marxist tomes. By and large, we were pushovers for the sentimentality that colored so many of our attitudes toward Russia when we fought a common enemy. That sentimentally afflicted all strata of society. It is as easy to find it in back issues of *Life* magazine as in the glowingly liberal opinion weeklies. (Long-time *Commonwealth* readers will recall that in July 1945, this magazine and the *Catholic World* were attacked by *Pravda* as the two worst examples of "the warmongering Catholic press"; so do not read the above as an apology.) A more general knowledge of the idea behind communism would have saved Americans from many of the illusions that drugged the Nation at the time.

On the other hand, there is a segment of American society which still stands in as much need of education about the idea of communism as those who thought about the subject so hazily in those days. This is a group which is ready to bracket every idea which does not conform to its own hardy rightwing convictions as communistic.

There is no more affinity between communism and the kind of liberalism espoused, say, by the ADA or the American Veterans' Committee than there is between the native fascism of Gerald L. K. Smith and the stanch republicanism of the late Senator Taft. But, for political and propaganda purposes, this group is forever ready to attribute every idea left of Dwight Eisenhower's fictitious dead center to Karl Marx. These "terrible simplifiers" have created all kinds of mischief by consistently tarring patriotic and idealistic people with the Communist brush. "If supporting public housing is communistic," many have felt through the years, "then I don't mind being communistic." A good example of this sort of thing was found recently when a supposed authority on communism before a congressional committee identified the writings of two Popes as communistic. As long as good people and good ideas are arbitrarily associated with communism, for partisan gain, the essential wickedness of communism as an idea will be obscured.

There are proposals now for a more general education in communism, notably a widely publicized plan offered by the American Bar Association. We heartily approve such a program, provided it truly means education about communism and is not used as a mean for partisan propagandists and lobbyists to include as communistic the teachings and beliefs of just about everyone who disagrees with them, from the Popes who wrote the social encyclicals to the liberals of Americans for Democratic Action.

The so-called rightwing cannot alone defeat communism in America. The attack of the Communists is directed against Americans of both parties and from every shade of the political spectrum. We need to fire our volleys against communism from both left and right. The sooner this simple fact is generally understood the better all-round. No group of Americans is the special target of communism, and none has a monopoly on

anticommunism. With wider understanding of the Communist idea, it might become clear to all that however we Americans may disagree among ourselves we face in communism a common enemy and will either have to hang together or hang separately.

FARM POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that correspondence between Mr. George E. Hulstrand, of Willmar, Minn., and Mr. Raymond C. Mitten, editor of the legislative department of the United States Chamber of Commerce, with regard to farm policy may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 13, 1954.

LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT, CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: As a member of the Willmar Chamber of Commerce, and as chairman of its National Affairs Committee, I wish to let you know very definitely that I do not agree and our chamber does not agree with your position with respect to the farm bill.

We don't mind so much that you take the position that you do but we certainly protest the misrepresentation that comes out in your legislative outlook.

It would seem to me that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States could make a contribution to the country and to its local chambers in this part of the country if it would center its efforts on policies designed to remedy the problems of distribution rather than to try to set farmer against consumer.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE E. HULSTRAND.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1954.

Mr. GEORGE E. HULSTRAND,
Hendrickson, Hulstrand, & Langsjoen,
Willmar, Minn.

DEAR MR. HULSTRAND: As editor of the Legislative Outlook, I have been asked to reply to your letter of July 15 regarding our recent article on the farm bill in that publication.

I am mainly concerned about your complaint that the article misrepresented the situation regarding the farm bill. I would very much appreciate receiving from you your reasons for believing that the Legislative Outlook has misrepresented the agriculture surplus situation and that matter of farm prices in general. I assure you that we attempt to be fair in our presentations in the Legislative Outlook and in all of our other publications.

I agree with you that better distribution is one answer to the farm-surplus problem and I believe that the dairy industry, for example, is to be congratulated for the work it is doing to improve distribution. I also doubt, however, that such efforts can provide a complete alternative to a changeover from rigid to flexible price supports.

I appreciate your interest in giving us your views on this highly important matter and sincerely hope that I will hear further from you regarding your complaint about misrepresentation in the Legislative Outlook.

Yours very truly,

RAYMOND C. MITTEN.

HENDRICKSON, HULSTRAND & LANGSJOEN,
Willmar, Minn., August 5, 1954.
Mr. RAYMOND C. MITTEN,
Editor, Legislative Outlook, Chamber
of Commerce of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MITTEN: In response to your letter of July 21, I wish to point out several

instances in which you in your Legislative Outlook misrepresent the farm-price-support legislation problem to the reader who has not taken the time or had the opportunity to study the issues with all the facts before him.

In the first place, in the issue of May 10, you state, among other things, that "the size and cost of surpluses have become alarming." If it is true that the size and cost of surpluses have become alarming, it is so only because those who are opposed to a genuine farm program have sought by means of propaganda and misrepresentation of facts to play up in the minds of the people that we cannot afford the cost of a workable farm program. This is simply not true. Upon examination, facts will show that while we have spent some money as taxpayers supporting a farm program that has not been extended as far as it should, this is a small cost compared to what we have paid to support other segments of our economy. For example, the loss in handling second-class mail, magazines and newspapers, in the Post Office Department during the last 8 years has been about \$3,800,000,000. The loss of the Government in the 23-year period during which the farm-price-support legislation has been in effect has been \$1,100,000,000. Of this \$1,100,000,000, \$20 million was for support of the basic crops, and the balance, \$1,080,000,000, was in support of nonbasics; and then when one compares this with the tremendous aid given to industry as a whole for means of subsidies of one form or the other since the war, I feel that the price paid for the farm-price-support program is small, indeed. We must also consider the fact that since 1933 the farm income has gone from \$7 billion to \$35 billion, and it requires no great deal of imagination to realize that the farmers in paying their income taxes have more than paid back to the Government what it has cost the Government to give them a farm-price-support program. I consider it a misrepresentation of fact when you show the cost of the farm-price-support legislation without also showing and pointing out and comparing that program with the subsidies which the Government has been granting, and is granting, other segments of the economy.

On the second page of your May 10 issue, you set out the quantity of products under the loan and ownership categories of the CCC. The implication is that there is a tremendous surplus which it will require from here to eternity to consume. Those figures are not indicative of anything unless they be compared with the consumption for annual periods, the total production for annual periods, and the projection into the future of what will be required in the way of those products in the future. One of the most sinister forms of misrepresentation is to cite figures without supplying all the data which would give them relevance to the problem as a whole.

On the second page of your May 10 issue, under the heading "Flexible supports," you state: "There is no assurance that there would not be any surpluses with flexible supports but it seems reasonable to assume that, with wider play of market forces permitted, there would be more encouragement of consumption and less encouragement of excessive production—production for sale to the Government." The facts are, and the figures of the Department of Agriculture will show, that when prices go down on farm products, the result is that farmers attempt to raise more products and put more acreage into production. It is only reasonable to assume that they will do this, for the reason that an increase in production is the only way in which they can meet the problem, and a very serious problem it is, which faces them when their income is cut by a reduced price.

Then you go into a devious and complex line of argument which goes like this: "Many farm State Congressmen contend extension

of rigid support at 90 percent of parity is necessary to maintain farm income. But it should be remembered that parity is related to prices, not to overall income (partly because geographical areas specialize in certain crops). And, except for the boost from Korean war buying in 1951, farm prices have been declining for 6 years despite rigid price supports. Besides, the law's production controls tend to become income controls by trying to curtail amounts available for sale." This seems to be a complicated way of saying that if prices are going to go down then the price supports must also follow in order that the price supports might reflect the downward trend of prices. If you argue thus, you misread the purpose of the law, which is to give the farmer a guaranty not of income, but of an assurance of a fair price after he has by his own labor, his ingenuity, his management, and all that the free competitive system offers, produced the crop.

I have failed to see in any of your publications a clear statement of the fact that the parity program is not a guaranty of income to the farmer whether he works his land efficiently or not. It would seem to me that you should take pains to point out to those who read your publication that all that the farm price-support legislation does is to remove an economic hazard out of the many that face the American farmer today. It seems to me to be good sense to expend money in order that we might protect the farmer against the hazard of fluctuating prices and to help him keep his business and his productive plant in good shape and in good order so that it might be utilized to the full when the demands of the consuming public increase through drought, war, or the natural increase of population.

In your June 21 issue, you become not only devious but it seems to me downright deceitful in your report on who receives farm price-support payments. That particular statement concerns itself only with basic crops and you entirely ignore the nonbasic crops which are also supported under the farm price program. It is outright misrepresentation of the facts to set out only a part of the facts in a situation such as this in order to imply that after all only a small part of the Nation's farmers are being supported by the farm price-support legislation.

In that same issue you also imply that the American taxpayers are paying \$30,000 an hour for storage of farm surpluses. This comes to \$720,000 a day for a total of \$262,800,000 a year. You also seem to deplore the fact that we have about \$6,500,000,000 invested in the farm price-support-loan program. For my part I think that is a good investment and one that should not be a cause for moaning and groaning but rather a cause for rejoicing. We don't hear any complaints about stockpiling atomic materials, about building up our military might, about stockpiling and accumulating strategic materials. I think if you would examine and present the facts on the stockpiling and accumulating of those types of materials, you would find that it would exceed by many many times the cost of the farm products now stored under the farm price-support-loan program. And I don't think that you are ready to say that the agricultural products under storage do not represent an important asset in the event of a national emergency.

Strangely enough, you make no mention of the program for wool and it seems to me that your conclusions and your statements in the July 5 issue under the heading "Butter to Burn," missed the point entirely. For one thing, I would like to have you explain to me how you expect the dairy farmers to produce butter at 75 percent of parity. You state that "They (many Members of Congress) haven't indicated what he (Benson) should do with the surplus butter." If you have done any reading on the subject at

all, you are bound to have noticed that there has been proposed what I consider a sound, workable program, such as has now been applied to wool, by which the farmer would be guaranteed a price at which he could produce the butter and given that guaranty in the form of compensatory payments and the butter then left to find its market price in the markets.

Then further on in the same article you make the same basic misrepresentation again, that since the butter program is bad and has bad features the basic crop-support program is worse because it is fixed at 90 percent of parity, ignoring the fact that under the rigid price-support program we have paid less than we have under those programs which have been on the nonfixed basis.

One of the real problems in the farm price support field has been that the enemies of the farmer and the enemies of any legislation to give the farmer a fair price for what he raises have always had just enough success to prevent the institution of a thorough, workable farm program. These same enemies of the farmer and of farm price-support legislation have also been insistent that Congress do nothing about investigating into the margin of profit that goes to people other than the producing farmers, who stand between the farmer and the consumer.

Yours very truly,

GEORGE E. HULSTRAND.

MIDYEAR ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota that he be permitted to speak for 5 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during this week President Eisenhower released a report on the state of our economy at midyear. All of us are glad to note what has been evident for some months, namely, that the economy is out of the trough of the recession of the past year.

As the President has pointed out, the performance of the economy during the past few months has indeed been remarkable. The economy has shown great resiliency and great ability to bounce back. This seems to be an opportune moment for some analysis of the bounce in the economy. And this, it seems to me, is the disappointing feature of the President's report. The report of three pages is all we are to have in the way of a midyear economic report. It gives us performance figures, but no analysis. At a generally happy, but still critical moment for the economy, we have no real analysis of the state of the economy; and we therefore have no basis for prediction of the shape of things to come.

I shall not undertake to provide a detailed analysis of the state of the economy, but I wish to point out a fact which is now generally accepted, namely, that the economic comeback, or bounce, of the past few months has been based, to a large extent, on an increase in consumer spending and retail sales. This increase began in March of this year, and there is every reason to believe that it was stimulated, in part, by tax relief in the form of excise-tax reduction in March. Also, I think we should make

note of the fact that much of the so-called bounce back or improvement in the economy was due to a change in the administration's credit and fiscal policies.

A little more than a year ago, I took sharp exception to what was known as the hard-money, tight-credit policy. As the record will bear out, in the spring months of 1954 that policy was abruptly changed. Today there is what might truly be called a soft-money, loose-credit fiscal policy. The Federal Reserve Board has made available an additional \$9 billion worth of credit by lowering the reserve requirements.

It is my considered judgment that when the facts are fully reviewed, and an analysis is made, it will be found that much of the so-called return from the recession, or improvement in economic conditions, has been due to two factors, namely, an increase in consumer spending and retail sales. This increase began in March of this year, and there is every reason to believe it was stimulated by excise-tax reductions and other revisions, together with the more basic and important change in the fiscal policy.

Fortune magazine for August, at pages 23 and 24, in its monthly evaluation of the economy, has this to say:

Spending increased at the expense of personal savings, which dipped from 8.6 percent of disposable income in the first quarter nearly to the normal rate of 7 percent in the second. Thus it was the consumer, not business or government, who led the recovery—to the quiet consternation of the remaining apostles of pure Keynesianism.

The pure Keynesian view, of course, is that business investment leads to the economy. A group of us in Congress have been arguing for the past year and a half that stimulating consumption through increasing purchasing power would be the key to economic revival. We set this view forth at some length in the recent debate on revision of our income-tax laws, and the figures now available on the economic recovery of the past few months seem to be a convincing vindication of our position.

In other words, it looks very much as if the "saucerizing out" of the economy—to use an administrative term—is not due to the original program of the administration. It is due to a revival of consumer spending based on tax reductions beyond those recommended by the administration, on a reversal by the administration of its tight credit policies.

The second comment I want to make on this midyear economic report concerns the nature of the report itself. Three scant pages of analysis is not much of a report for a period when the economy seems to be at a turning point. Last year, at a point of downturn in the economy, we had no midyear report at all. This is a striking contrast with the last administration, when midyear economic reports were issued in considerable detail.

The fact is that there has been a tendency in this administration to provide the American people with much less economic data and analysis than did the last administration. There seems to have been a tendency, in fact, to be critical of the Council of Economic Advisers and even of the purposes the Council is in-

tended to serve under the Employment Act of 1946.

Under December of last year we did not even have a full Council of Economic Advisers, and between March and August of last year the Council, as such, was not in operation at all.

The declaration of policy in the Employment Act of 1946 reads, in part:

It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

One of the ways in which the Government can fulfill this responsibility is to provide as many facts as possible on the state of the economy.

The present midyear economic report does not do this. Instead, it is a rather political document, comparing the state of the economy in different administrations. This may be good politics, but it is not very good economics.

The President notes that some people have been critical of the course of the economy lately. One reason for this, he suggests, is "that the thinking of many people is geared to the concept of uninterrupted progress."

Mr. President, I confess to being one of those people. I am in favor of uninterrupted economic progress. I realize it is not easy to achieve, but I believe that patient and extensive analysis of the economic facts can help us achieve progress. That is why I think we are entitled to a better midyear economic report. That is why I think we ought to get going with a census of business and manufacturing. I hope we will get an appropriation for it this year, and I think a grave error was made in not appropriating for it last year.

The truth is that the economy has not really made progress over the past year—instead it has lost ground.

From the point of view of economic progress and economic growth, our gross national product in the second quarter of 1954 was about \$27 billion below the level required for full employment and full production. Gross national product for the second quarter was about a billion below that for the first quarter.

The fact is that the well-being of our economy depends on economic progress. The objectives of the Employment Act of 1946—maximum employment, production, and purchasing power—depends on it. And the less interrupted that progress is, the better. I think this midyear economic report is in some ways an alarming document—not because it brings bad news—but simply because it does not bring enough news. And what news it does contain is sugar coated.

I hope that in the future the administration will see fit to provide us with more facts and analysis. It seems to me that this information is due the business community and the public, and I am sure that the business community and the public can use this information for the progress and the good of the entire economy.

Finally, within the past week I have noted that the President of the United States, at long last, has filled the two vacancies on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I have

been noting for 18 months that the vacancies have existed. I have just received information that the President had this matter brought to his attention, and within the past 10 days or 2 weeks has taken action to fill the vacancies.

This is very important, because the Federal Reserve Board really determines the fiscal policy, the monetary policy, of the Government, in conjunction with the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of President Eisenhower's report on the national economy.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S REPORT ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

1
The paramount fact about the economy at midyear is that the recent decline in economic activity has come to a halt. For the last 6 months the Federal Reserve index of industrial production has moved within an extremely narrow range. At the beginning of the year the index stood at 125 (average, 1947-49, 100). In March and April the index registered 123, in May and June 124.

2
In view of this narrow range of fluctuation in total industrial production during the past 6 months, we may justly take an average of the past 6 months as indicative of the recent level of economic activity. It then becomes of interest to compare this level with that attained by the economy during the first half of 1953, when our Nation was enjoying the greatest prosperity we have yet known.

3
Making that comparison, we find that industrial production has been running 8.1 percent lower in 1954 than in 1953. But in forming a judgment about the state of the economy we must bear in mind that the widely used Federal Reserve index of production covers only manufacturing and mining; that it omits construction, agriculture, transportation, and the great range of personal services; and that the omitted parts are much more important sources of employment than the included parts. It is desirable, therefore, to look at more comprehensive measures or indicators of economic activity.

4
The most significant of these measures are the following:

(A) Gross national product, which expresses the dollar value of the Nation's total output of commodities and services.

(B) Nonagricultural employment (as estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics), which expresses the number of wage and salary workers in business establishments outside of agriculture.

(C) Personal income, which is simply the sum of all individual and family incomes.

(D) Disposable personal income, which is simply the sum of all individual and family incomes minus personal income tax payments.

(E) Bank debits outside New York City, which express debits to individual and business bank accounts, and thus measure the flow of money payments in industrial, commercial, and, to some degree, financial transactions. (New York City debits are omitted because they are dominated by financial transactions.)

5
When we now compare the first half of 1954 with the first half of 1953, we obtain the following results:

Percent change from first half of 1953 to first half of 1954

	Down
Gross national production.....	2.7
Nonagricultural employment.....	2.6
	Up
Personal income.....	0.2
Disposable personal income.....	1.4
Bank debits outside New York City.....	0.9

It is fair to conclude from these facts that the recent economic decline, on an overall basis, has been very small. This conclusion will not be changed if we take account of the increase in population. Thus, while the total disposable personal income increased 1.40 percent, the disposable personal income per capita declined merely 0.3 percent between the first half of 1953 and the first half of 1954.

6
In judging the performance of the American economy during 1954 we have taken the first half of 1953 as the standard. It may help us to see the current state of the economy in better perspective if we go 1 year further back. The first half of 1952 was not characterized by the same intensity of activity, but it was the best year we had experienced prior to 1953. Therefore, while 1952 does not provide us with as high a standard as 1953, it still constitutes a very high standard.

7
If we now compare the first half of 1954 with the first half of 1952, the showing of the rather broad indicators to which we have already referred is as follows:

Percent change from first half 1953 to first half 1954

	Up
Industrial production.....	3.3
Gross national product.....	4.4
Nonagricultural employment.....	1.1
Personal income.....	7.2
Disposable personal income.....	8.8
Per capita disposable income.....	5.3
Bank debits outside New York City.....	10.2

Every one of these indicators shows a rise, and some of the increases are not small.

Since 1952 was the best year before this administration took office, it follows that economic activity of late has been higher than at any time before this administration assumed responsibility. And since 1953 was a still better year than 1954 is turning out to be, it follows that the over-all performance of the American economy thus far during this administration has been better than during any earlier time.

8
Some of the economic indicators used above are expressed in a physical unit, others in a monetary unit. It is well, therefore, to say a word about the price level.

When we compare the first half of 1954 with the first half of 1953 we find that the index of wholesale prices is up 0.8 percent and that the index of consumer prices is up 1.1 percent. Not only are these increases tiny but our measures of price movements fail to take account of discounts, concessions, bargain sales, etc., that have been a significant feature of recent markets. If we allow for these developments, we can surely say, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that the value of the people's money has remained entirely intact.

This conclusion also holds if we carry comparisons 1 year farther back—that is, if we compare the first half of 1954 with the first half of 1952. On this basis, the index of wholesale prices is down 1.3 percent and the index of consumer prices is up 1.9 percent.

Let us take note of another fact, namely, that while recent economic activity has been at a high level and the value of the dollar has been stable, the increases in wages, which is one of the principal expressions of the progressiveness of the American economy, has continued.

Average hourly earnings have moved as follows:

	1st half of 1952 to 1st half of 1954	1st half of 1953 to 1st half of 1954
Manufacturing, total.....	+9.1	+2.9
Durable.....	+9.2	+2.2
Nondurable.....	+7.8	+3.8
Building construction.....	+13.3	+4.3
Retail trade.....	+10.8	+4.3

10
The above statistics suggest a high—or even an improving—state of economic welfare. An economic historian of an earlier generation, if confronted with facts such as these, would have felt no hesitation in describing recent times as a period of great prosperity. And if our imaginary historian had stopped to take account of the difficulties of shifting from a war to a more nearly peace economy, with Government expenditure on national security dropping nearly one-fifth in a year, he might well have described the last year or two as a time when economic miracles were being wrought.

11
Not all of our contemporaries, however, are describing the performance of the American economy in these lyrical terms. The reason is partly that a decline occurred after July 1953 in economic activity, particularly in employment, and that the thinking of many people is geared to the concept of uninterrupted progress. The reason is partly that this rather minor decline has been better advertised than many major declines of our past. The reason is also that, while the decline has been small on an overall basis, it has affected seriously some industries, communities, and groups in our society. Factory employment, particularly in the durable-goods industries, has suffered, while agricultural prices and incomes have shown the adverse effects of shrinking export markets and unbalanced production.

12
Unemployment is now greater than during the time of the Korean war, as the following figures indicate:

Unemployment as percent of civilian labor force

	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
January-March.....	5.0	7.2	3.8	3.2	2.8	5.5
April-June.....	5.4	5.2	2.8	2.7	2.3	5.2
July.....	6.4	5.0	2.9	3.0	2.4	5.1

It is clear, however, that unemployment in recent months has not been larger than during comparable months in 1949 and 1950.

13
Moreover, the rate of unemployment has shown some tendency to diminish of late. This is one of numerous signs of economic improvement. Retail sales have recently been rising again. Business expenditures on capital expansion and improvement are continuing at a high rate. New construction contracts are running well above the level of a year ago. Inventories have been reduced and are now in better adjustment to current sales. The financial markets have been displaying great strength. The level of business and consumer confidence in the economic future is high and improving.

14

The standards that our generation applies to the performance of an economic system are very different from those that our fathers applied and even different from those that we ourselves applied only a few years ago. It is a good thing that our standards are higher. Great economic and social achievements will not be made unless we are sensitive to the need for making them.

The economic program being enacted by the present Congress marks a milestone in constructive legislation. It will help to reduce unemployment and to stimulate enterprise and development in all directions. In the months and years ahead we must continue to bring knowledge, cool judgment, and a concern for people to the consideration of economic problems. In the measure that we do this, we may look forward with great confidence to the future.

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE "PACKAGE BILL"

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina that he may speak for 5 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it has come to my attention through a front-page press story, that the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives on Monday will attempt a surprise "coup" by trying to force through the House, under a suspension of the rules, a "package bill," which would include the Postmaster General's reclassification plan, increased postal rates on first-class mail matter, and increased pay for Federal employees.

This may be nothing more than another Summerfield-planted rumor. However, so all may be aware of how postal employees feel about this method of legislation by marriage, I wish to read a press release by 8 major postal organizations, representing 450,000 of the Nation's postal workers, as follows:

AN URGENT, FRANK STATEMENT OF POSTAL EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS ON THE POSTAL PAY ISSUE

To all Members of Congress:

Eight major postal organizations, representing 450,000 of the Nation's postal workers, have sought in the 83d Congress a long overdue and justifiable increase in postal salaries.

We appreciate the stand and efforts of our many friends in the Congress who have conscientiously supported fair legislation to grant this increase. We appreciate and applaud the action of the House on Monday, August 9, in passing the Corbett bill, H. R. 9245, which provided a fair compromise increase in pay and which, just as fairly, provides for a joint committee of the Congress to study postal field service reclassification and report back to the 84th Congress for action as then deemed proper and appropriate.

The controversy is before the House because of two great stumbling blocks:

1. The demand of the Postmaster General that Congress strip itself of authority to establish the classification of postal positions and set the salary schedules for those positions.

2. The insistent demand that Congress provide the revenue to pay for any salary increase through an increase of postal rates.

We have been, are currently, and will remain adamantly opposed to removing our

classifications and salary schedules away from the control of Congress. We have consistently enjoyed fair treatment at the hands of Congress. We know without question that in the final analysis the Congress of the United States is the only place we can appeal errors and wrongs which might conceivably, and most probably would, creep in under discretionary authority in the executive branch to determine classifications and salary schedules. Despite statements to the contrary, this appeal has not been protected under the Rees proposal.

We do not oppose increased postal rates, but we cannot support the fact that the salary schedules within the Post Office Department are now, or ever should be, determined by the revenue produced by the Department. We deem it gross injustice to predicate the level of postal salaries on whether or not there is a postal deficit. This is totally inconsistent with the policy and operational procedure applicable to any other agency or department of Government. Further, it is grossly misleading unless first the area of business and service within that Department is determined.

We desire to make our stand eminently clear in this pressing issue currently before you.

We urgently appeal for a fair salary increase, not secured through marriage to controversial issues before you, but dependent upon the merits of whether or not we—the postal employees of this Nation—deserve such an increase.

Being frank, we desire you to know that beyond a shadow of a doubt, the postal employees of this Nation will not place blame on congressional Members who in good conscience do not permit themselves to vote for a postal pay raise if such raise is coupled to issues on proposals to which the Member is opposed.

Representing 450,000 postal employees, we request you to vote against the proposed package-pay plan to be presented to the House on Monday. This attempt represents a complete usurpation of the power of the legislative body by the administrative branch of government. The classification proposal for the postal service in this bill has been turned down by committees in both Houses. Bills have been passed in both Houses carrying provisions entirely contrary to the Rees proposal. The attempt to jam this provision through the Congress in the final minutes of the session represents unprecedented administrative capriciousness.

We ask you to stand by the Corbett reclassification plan approved by the House on August 9 by a vote of 352 to 29, and vote down the combination program now suggested. Such a vote will make certain that the wishes of Congress shall not be thwarted, and that the unfair classification proposal of the Postmaster General will not be forced on postal employees.

We are deeply grateful to you for any favorable consideration that you can grant to our request.

Respectfully yours,

National Association of Letter Carriers, William C. Doherty, President; National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Ross Messer, Legislative Representative; National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers, Harold McAvoy, President; National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Leo E. George, President; National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, Paul M. Castiglioni, Legislative Representative; National Postal Transport Association, W. M. Thomas, President; National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Paul Benson, President; United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Samuel E. Klein, President.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (H. R. 10051) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN SENATE BILLS

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, there are at the desk a number of messages from the House of Representatives on bills which were reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. I have talked with the leader of the majority. It is my understanding that I may take them up one by one and try to get through with them. I am sorry to have to take them up at a time when there are so few Senators present on the floor, but, as we go along, if there is any objection to any one of them, I shall withhold that particular one.

EXTENSION OF DETENTION BENEFITS UNDER WAR CLAIMS ACT TO EMPLOYEES OF CONTRACTORS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 541) to extend detention benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to employees of contractors with the United States, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "War Claims Act Amendments of 1954."

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) Clause (2) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2004), is hereby amended by striking out "(A) a person within the purview of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes', approved September 7, 1916, as amended, and as extended; or (B) a person within the purview of the act entitled 'An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes', approved December 2, 1942, as amended; or (C) a person within the purview of the Missing Persons Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended; or (D)."

(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (f) of such section is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(3) The following provisions of such act of December 2, 1942, as amended, shall not apply in the case of such civilian American citizens: The last sentence of section 101 (a), section 101 (b), section 101 (d), section 104, and section 105."

(c) Such subsection (f) is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(10) No benefits provided by this subsection for injury, disability, or death shall accrue to any person who, without regard to this subsection, is entitled to or has received benefits for the same injury, disability, or death under such act of December 2, 1942, as amended.

"(11) No benefits provided by this subsection shall accrue to any person to whom benefits have been paid, or are payable, under

the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, or any extension thereof, by reason of disability or death of an employee of the United States suffered after capture, detention, or other restraint by an enemy of the United States, when such disability or death is deemed, in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, to have resulted from injury occurring while in the performance of duty, under subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended,' approved July 28, 1945, as amended."

(d) The second proviso of subsection (b) of section 5 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' as amended," approved July 28, 1945, is hereby amended by inserting immediately after "gratuity from the United States" the following: "(other than detention benefits under section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948)."

(e) (1) Individuals entitled to benefits under subsections (b), (c), or (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, solely by reason of the amendments made by this act, must file claim therefor within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

(2) The time limitations applicable to the filing of claims for benefits extended and made applicable to any individual by subsection (f) of such section 5 shall not begin to run until the date of enactment of this act with respect to any individual who is entitled to such benefits solely by reason of the amendments made by this act. This paragraph shall not be construed to affect the right of any individual to receive such benefits with respect to any period prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 102. (a) (1) Subsection (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; subsection (c) of section 6 of such act; and paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of such section 6, are each hereby amended by striking out "dependent" each time it occurs.

(2) Subsection (d) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (2), striking out the period at the end of clause (3) and inserting in lieu thereof: "; and", and by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(4) Parents (in equal shares) if there is no husband, or child."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to benefits paid prior to the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Individuals entitled to benefits solely by reason of the amendments made by this section must file claim therefor within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 103. The War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 15. (a) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim for compensation filed by or on behalf of any individual who, being then an American citizen, served in the military or naval forces of any government allied with the United States during World War II who was held as a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which such Allied government has been at war subsequent to such date. Compensation shall be payable under this section in accordance with the standards established by, and at the rates prescribed in, subsection (b) of section 6 of this act, and

paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (d) of such section 6.

"(b) The amount payable under this section shall be reduced by such sum as the individual entitled to compensation under this section has received or is entitled to receive from any government by reason of the same detention.

"(c) In the event of death of the individual entitled to compensation under this section, payment may be made to the persons specified in paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 6 of this act.

"(d) Claims for benefits under this section must be filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the war claims fund established by section 13 of this act.

"Sec. 16. (a) As used in this section, the term 'merchant seaman' means any individual who was employed as a seaman or crew member on any vessel registered under the laws of the United States, or under the laws of any government friendly to the United States during World War II, and who was a citizen of the United States on and after December 7, 1941, to the date of his death or the date of filing claim under this section; except any such individual who is entitled to, or who has received, benefits under section 5 of this act as a 'civilian American citizen.'

"(b) The Commission is authorized to receive and determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim for detention benefits filed by or on behalf of any merchant seaman who, being then a merchant seaman, was captured or interned or held by the Government of Germany or the Imperial Japanese Government, its agents or instrumentalities in World War II for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, during which he was held by either such government as a prisoner, internee, hostage, or in any other capacity. Detention benefits shall be paid under this section at the rates prescribed and in the manner provided in subsections (c) and (d) of section 5 of this act.

"(c) Payment of any claim filed under this section shall not be made to any merchant seaman, or to any survivor or survivors thereof, who, voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any government hostile to the United States during World War II.

"(d) Claims for benefits under this section must be filed within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(e) Any claim allowed under the provisions of this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the war claims fund established by section 13 of this act.

"Sec. 17. (a) (1) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by—

"(A) any individual who—

"(i) on or after December 7, 1941, was a member of the military or naval forces of the United States;

"(ii) is the survivor of any deceased individual described in subparagraph (i);

"(iii) was a national of the United States on December 7, 1941, and is a national of the United States on the date of enactment of this section; or

"(iv) is the survivor of any deceased individual who was a national of the United States on December 7, 1941, and would be a national of the United States on the date of enactment of this section if living; or

"(B) any partnership, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, in which more than 50 percent of the ownership was vested, di-

rectly or indirectly, both on December 7, 1941, and on the date of enactment of this section, in individuals referred to in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph; for losses arising as a result of the sequestration of accounts, deposits, or other credits of such individual or legal entity in the Philippines by the Imperial Japanese Government.

"(2) The Commission is authorized to receive and to determine, according to law, the amount and validity, and provide for the payment of any claim filed by any bank or other financial institution doing business in the Philippines which reestablished sequestered accounts, deposits, or other credits of—

"(A) any individual referred to in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

"(B) any partnership, firm, corporation, or other legal entity, in which more than 50 percent of the ownership was vested, directly or indirectly, both on December 7, 1941, and on the date of reestablishment of such sequestered credits, in individuals referred to in such subparagraph (A);

for reimbursement of the amounts of such sequestered credits paid by such bank or financial institution.

"(b) Claims must be filed under this section within 1 year after the date of enactment of this section.

"(c) Where any individual entitled to payment under this section is under any legal disability, payment may be made in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of section 5 of this act. In the case of the death of any individual entitled to payment of any claim under this section, payment of such claim shall be made to the individuals specified, and in the order provided, in subsection (d) of section 6 of this act; except that no payment shall be made under this section to any individual who voluntarily, knowingly, and without duress, gave aid to or collaborated with or in any manner served any government hostile to the United States during World War II.

"(d) Each claim allowed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the war claims fund established under section 13 of this act. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay such claims as follows:

"(1) In the case of each claim allowed in an amount equal to or less than \$500, such claim shall be paid in full; and

"(2) In the case of each claim allowed in an amount greater than \$500, such claim shall be paid in two installments. The first installment shall be paid in an amount equal to \$500 plus 66⅔ per centum of the amount of such claim allowed in excess of \$500. The last installment shall be computed as of September 1, 1956, under the next sentence of this paragraph, and, as so computed, shall be paid from the sums remaining in the War Claims Fund on that date. If the sums remaining in the war claims fund on September 1, 1956, are sufficient to satisfy all claims allowed under this section and not paid in full, the unpaid portion of each such claim shall be paid in full; if the sums remaining in the war claims fund on September 1, 1956, are not sufficient to satisfy all claims allowed under this section and not paid in full, the last installment payable on each such claim shall be reduced ratably, and, as so reduced, shall be paid from the War Claims Fund."

SEC. 104. (a) Section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 App. U. S. C., sec. 2012), is hereby amended by striking out subsections (b) and (c) thereof, and by inserting immediately after subsection (a) thereof the following:

"(b) Before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of Labor shall estimate and report to the President the total amount which will be required to pay all benefits payable by reason of section 5 (f) of this act. If the Presi-

dent approves the amount so estimated as reasonably accurate, the total amount so estimated and approved shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury; if the President does not so approve he shall determine such amount, and the amount so determined shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury. Such certification shall be made on or before September 1, 1956. The Secretary of the Treasury shall then transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount certified to him under this subsection.

"(c) Before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of Labor shall estimate and report to the President the total amount which will be required to pay all additional benefits payable as a result of the enactment of section 4 (c) of this act. If the President approves the amount so estimated as reasonably accurate, the total amount so estimated and approved shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury; if the President does not so approve, he shall determine such amount, and the amount so determined shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury. Such certification shall be made on or before September 1, 1956. The Secretary of the Treasury shall then transfer from the War Claims Fund to the general fund of the Treasury a sum equal to the total amount certified to him under this subsection."

(b) Subsection (d) of such section 13 is hereby amended by striking out "The Secretary of State" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "On or before August 1, 1956, the Secretary of State."

SEC. 105. Within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States shall wind up its affairs in connection with the settlement of all claims for benefits authorized by the amendments made by this act.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. As used in this title—

(a) The term "prisoner of war" has the meaning assigned to it by section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; and

(b) The term "civilian American citizen" has the meaning assigned to it by subsection (a) of section 5 of such act.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in cooperation with, and with the assistance of, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Defense, shall conduct a study of—

(1) the mortality rates among prisoners of war and civilian American citizens, with a view to determining whether their abnormally high mortality rate is directly attributable to the malnutrition and other hardships suffered by them while held as prisoners of war, hostages, internees, or in any other capacity;

(2) the mental and physical consequences of the malnutrition and other hardships suffered by prisoners of war and civilian American citizens while so held; and

(3) the procedures and standards which should be applied in the diagnosis of the mental and physical condition of prisoners of war and civilian American citizens.

SEC. 203. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall report the results of such study to the President for transmittal to the Congress.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to extend benefits under the War Claims Act of 1948 to certain classes of persons, and for other purposes."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to accept the House amendments to S. 541. If my colleagues will bear with me, I shall explain briefly why I take this position.

The purpose of S. 541, which I introduced and which passed the Senate on July 18, 1953, was to correct an inequity which exists under the present provisions of the War Claims Act of 1948. The bill authorizes detention benefits to be granted to certain employees of American war contractors who were engaged in the construction of airfields, fortifications, and ship facilities in the Pacific islands prior to World War II and who were interned by the Japanese in prisoner-of-war camps. Their present exclusion from the benefits of the War Claims Act is manifestly unjust.

The amendments to S. 541, proposed by the House committee, and which the House adopted, would correct certain other equally glaring injustices under the present coverage of the War Claims Act.

Detention benefits would be granted to a few other small groups of prisoners of war and civilian internees who are as deserving as the groups already covered by the act. Also American nationals, including survivors of Bataan and Corregidor, whose bank accounts and other credits were confiscated by the Japanese, and whose claims against Japan were waived in the Japanese Peace Treaty, would be compensated. This amendment accomplishes exactly the same purpose as the bill (S. 3305), which I also introduced, and which was favorably reported by the Judiciary Committee on July 19, 1954.

The enactment of Senate bill 541, with the amendments proposed by the House, will substantially wind up the war claims program instituted through the War Claims Act of 1948.

Question has been asked whether there is enough money in the War Claims Fund to take care of the provisions of this bill. The answer to that question is that after the payment of all claims presently authorized by the War Claims Act, including the revised awards in favor of religious organizations, the Budget Bureau has stated that at least \$13 billion will remain in the War Claims Fund. This amount should cover all or nearly all of the claims authorized by Senate bill 541, and the House amendments thereto.

Let me recapitulate, Mr. President: Basically, the House version of this bill consists of two bills, both of which have been reported favorably to the Senate from the Committee on the Judiciary, and one of which has passed the Senate. These are (1) the original Senate bill 541, which has already passed the Senate, and which would grant detention benefits under the War Claims Act to employees of American war contractors who were captured and interned by the Japanese in prisoner-of-war camps; and (2) Senate bill 3305, reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee on July 19, which would compensate American nationals, including survivors of Bataan and Corregidor, whose bank accounts and other deposits in the Philippines were confiscated by the Japanese. The claims of these people against the Japanese Government were waived by Secretary Dulles in the Japanese Peace Treaty.

The House amendments correct certain other injustices under the present War Claims Act by extending the detention benefits provided by the act to a few small groups presently excluded, such as about 1,250 Federal employees in the same situation as the war contractors' employees, and approximately 250 merchant seamen. The House amendments also provide that a study should be made of the effects of malnutrition and other hardships suffered by prisoners of war and civilian internees.

With respect to the major provision of the House amendment compensating American nationals whose bank accounts and other deposits in the Philippines were confiscated by the Japanese, the equity of this compensation is clearly seen when it is realized that in the Japanese Peace Treaty, the United States took from these citizens the right to claim compensation from the Japanese for the property that had been taken from them. This proposed legislation as it comes from the House—and in that respect, the effect is the same as in the bill (S. 3305) reported favorably from the Judiciary Committee, and now on the Senate Calendar—would merely carry out the legal obligation of the United States to compensate its own nationals for the rights thus taken away from them by the treaty.

Mr. President, I have indicated that the bill, as it comes from the House, is in line with the recommendations of the President. I cannot say it follows the recommendations of the President because, in fact, the bill was introduced more than a year before the President made his recommendations. But the bill is in line with recommendations made by the President; and in order to establish that fact, I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD the text of a letter addressed by the Executive Office of the President of the United States to the President of the Senate, under date of June 28, 1954, together with a report transmitted with the letter. The report concerns the recommended provisions contained in Senate bill 541, as it passed the House.

Mr. President, it will be noted that in his letter to the Vice President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget said that because of the hardships suffered by many United States nationals as a result of the actions of certain foreign governments, for which this bill would afford some relief, he would strongly urge that this proposed legislation be enacted to the extent provided, before the close of the present session of Congress.

Mr. President, let me join my own views to those of the President's spokesman, and urge the Senate to concur in the House amendments to the bill.

I now move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, certainly the leadership has not acquainted me with any arrangement which may have been made with respect to Senate bill 541. I am generally familiar with the matter, but I believe it should be deferred until such time as the majority

leader, with whom probably the Senator from Nevada has talked, has an opportunity to examine further into the matter.

Until that time, Mr. President, and since the matter comes up as a privileged question, I must make the point of the absence of a quorum, until the majority leader can return to the Chamber.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator from Illinois will withhold suggesting the absence of a quorum. I have had a talk with the majority leader. I would prefer to have him here. I would gladly defer requesting the consideration of this matter until the majority leader is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada withdraw his motion?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do, Mr. President, for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion of the Senator from Nevada is withdrawn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether he intends to submit other matters of the same sort.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do. There are a number of similar matters, which I believe will take only a minute or so to dispose of.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Cannot we also leave them in a deferred status until such time as they can be cleared with the leadership?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Is it preferred that I take them up one by one at this time? All of them relate to House messages which are at the desk, and involve amendments by the House of Representatives, in which the concurrence of the Senate is requested.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They could be presented now, although we have been waiting patiently for approximately 3 hours in order to proceed with consideration of the mutual-security appropriation bill. Of course, if the matters to which the Senator from Nevada has referred will take only a few moments to dispose of, I myself would not wish to interpose objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, if after presenting the matters at this time, the situation would be such that I would have to go over them again, later on, at a time when the majority leader is here, I would prefer not to proceed now, for it would be a waste of time.

On the other hand, the majority leader has told me that I could proceed with them, and of course I took advantage of whatever time was available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. But I would prefer not to present them at this time, if the result would be merely to have to present them again, later on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the present occupant of the majority leader's chair has had no instruction regarding these measures or these messages from the House of Representatives. So, Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will defer them until the majority leader returns—

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the able Senator from Illinois that in all

these matters, I am substituting for the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, who is absent because of certain misfortune which has come to his family. Therefore, he asked me to take over this work. It is not because of any wish on my part, that I undertake this burden.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand. But, Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will withhold, momentarily, his motion—

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10051) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senate has now proceeded to the consideration of H. R. 10051, the mutual security appropriation bill for fiscal year 1955. As chairman of the Senate committee charged with handling this bill, I wish to make a few brief remarks concerning some of the general considerations which helped shape the nature of our recommendations.

Mr. President, it is now 9 years since the last shot was fired in World War II, but the first month in which no local war threatens to engulf the world in a new global conflict. Yet, as we look about us, we cannot find the solace that comes with the end of the mass slaughter which is war. An uneasy calm has descended momentarily upon the world, but anxiety has not diminished. Although the shooting has stopped, the world is no closer to a just and enduring peace. The dangers are just as great today. The free world continues to live in the evil shadow of the malevolent Red imperialism. Now, more than ever, we must retain our sense of proportion and hold firmly to our faith in the justice of our cause.

We are faced today by an enemy hostile to human freedom, holding in tight control more than 800 million people and enormous material resources, possessed of a huge war machine, armed with the most modern weapons of mass destruction. No one nation alone can face with confidence this vast assembly of power. Only by collective defense can the nations of the free world hope to meet this fearful threat to their survival without the alternative, over the long pull, of economic collapse. It is within this concept of a free world-defense community that our own military strategy and programs have been developed—each nation contributing to the whole those forces and resources which it can most effectively provide.

The principal purpose of the bill now before the Senate is to assist our free world partners to raise and support the forces required for collective defense. Whereas, in the early years of the foreign-aid program, emphasis was placed principally on economic aid, today only \$184,500,000 of the funds provided in this bill are for that type of aid, under the caption of "Development Assistance." Since 1948, when economic aid totaled \$4.4 billion, the economic strength of most of our allies, particularly in Europe, has shown remarkable improvement so that now the emphasis may be shifted safely to defense aid. Of the roughly \$185 million in development assistance provided in H. R. 10051, virtually all is for India and the Near East.

A total of \$2,618,798,195 in new appropriations is provided for mutual-defense assistance—\$1,392,700,000 for military assistance; \$795 million for southeast Asia and the western Pacific, and for direct-forces support; and \$431,098,195 for defense support. These new appropriations plus the continued availability of unobligated funds recommended by the committee will make available in fiscal year 1955 a total of \$5,176,737,863 in mutual-defense assistance—\$3,932,092,283 for military assistance; \$795 million for southeast Asia, and so forth; and \$449,645,580 for defense support.

The bill also provides \$121,457,621 in new appropriations for technical cooperation and \$66,069,000 for other programs, including administrative expenses other than for military assistance. Since the committee recommended the continued availability of unobligated balances for other programs in the amount of \$23,574,060, a total of \$89,643,060 will be available for those programs in fiscal year 1955.

A total of \$2,990,824,816 in new appropriations is provided in this bill, which, together with \$2,581,513,728 in unobligated balances recommended by the committee to be continued available, will provide a grand total of \$5,572,338,544 in fiscal year 1955.

Every field of human endeavor—politics, economics, education, science, religion—are exploited by the Communists in their efforts to subvert and weaken the nations of the free world. Patience, perseverance, and understanding will be required in ever-increasing measure if free-world unity is to survive in the long term the stresses and strains of Communist efforts to break it apart.

Upon the United States has fallen perhaps the greatest responsibility to preserve this unity. History has thrust upon us the role of leadership in this world struggle against Communist aggression. It is a role which we neither sought nor desired. But the American people have always been ready and willing to fully meet their international obligations, and in my judgment the people of this country will continue to carry this burden of our international responsibilities willingly so long as they are convinced that the interests of the Nation demand it of them. For this assurance they rightfully look to the executive branch of the Government and to the Congress. That is why the sev-

eral committees of the Congress concerned with foreign aid have conducted such extensive and thorough hearings on the fiscal year 1955 program. The recommendations of the Senate Committee on Appropriations are based not only on the detailed and voluminous data and testimony presented during the course of its own hearings, but also on the hearings and reports of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. The measure now awaiting Senate approval incorporates the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations. I submit the bill, and bespeak for it the earnest consideration of the Senate.

In addition to what I have said, I should like to point out that it is my personal opinion, and I think it is the opinion of the majority of the Committee on Appropriations, that in the coming year, more than ever before, we must emphasize the word "mutual" in connection with this program. In other words, the feeling of the members of the committee, as I interpret it by their statements, by their questions, and by their votes, is to the effect that they want emphasis placed on American aid being channeled to the countries that are willing to help themselves and wish to be willing partners in this great program of mutual aid, of which we are a part. Furthermore, the members of the committee desire and—we emphasize this to the administrators of this program and to the countries who are our partners—that more than ever the word "mutual" shall be considered in the administration of the act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to compliment the Senator from New Hampshire for the remark he has just made. I am sure that what he says is also the feeling of Congress and the administration, which he so ably represents.

If the chairman will permit me to do so, I should like to ask several short questions of him.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the understanding of the chairman that the Foreign Operations Administration is to be abolished and go out of existence on June 30, 1955?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to supplement the answer of the chairman by saying that, as a matter of fact, a study has already been conducted with the view of distributing the functions of the Foreign Operations Administration, which must necessarily be distributed when the agency is abolished.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On June 30, 1955, or before?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the understanding of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that title III, the point 4 program, under the authorization adopted by the Foreign Relations Committee and agreed to by the House, will become, not later than June 30 of

next year, a part of the State Department?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the distinguished chairman's further understanding that so far as title II is concerned, the title which deals with economic aid, that title will expire on June 30, 1955, with only a 1 year's liquidation period, taking it to June 30, 1956?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it the chairman's understanding that there is no termination date so far as military assistance is concerned?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that it is to be administered by the Defense Department, so that the program may be continued as it needs to be continued, under the aegis of the Secretary of Defense and his assistants?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, we can be absolutely certain that the Foreign Operations Administration will be abolished as of June 30, 1955?

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Montana, who has served so ably in both Houses of Congress, that I have been around Congress for some time, and I know that sometimes we may have in mind a certain plan with the hope it may be carried out; and in that connection I can certainly speak only for myself, and cannot give any blanket guaranty for anyone else. I mean that is my understanding, and that is certainly my belief. I am not equivocating in any way, but at the same time I must leave a little loophole to the extent that I cannot speak for anyone else.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to close that one little loophole, because what the chairman has said is, in effect, the intent of Congress, and was the intent of Congress a year ago.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois has pointed out that under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire at the present time negotiations are going on by means of which the President, under authority given to him by the Mutual Security Act, is arranging for the transfer of various units of the Foreign Operations Administration into the proper permanent agencies.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not want to have established so-called temporary permanent agencies. I am afraid that if Congress does not adhere firmly to its present determination and does not see to it that this organization is out of existence not later than June 30, 1955, we will find an attempt being made to continue this temporary agency on a permanent basis, which would be contrary to the expressed will of Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to answer that by saying I believe the Senator is absolutely correct. I can definitely make that statement not only for myself, but for the administration as well. I left the little loophole I referred to because next year, if I am still chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and have the responsibility of presenting a

bill in response to a foreign-aid request, I do not want to have someone say, "I interpreted the Senator's statement to mean that this was out the window," and that nothing can be done about it. I agree that FOA should not be continued as a temporary agency. I agree that that is the intent of Congress. I agree that it should be the will and intent of this administration to abolish it. Certainly anything that is continued should be shifted to a permanent agency. I do not want to equivocate on that. However, I did not want to be interpreted as having overspoken, perhaps, if some part of this program should be continued next year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to make it very plain that I believe Governor Stassen has done an exceedingly good job in bringing about greater efficiency and lower expenditures, and also in the reduction of personnel. There is nothing personal about my attitude, because I was one of those who advocated that ECA, the so-called Marshall plan, end before June 30, 1952, as originally contemplated. With me, it is a matter of principle. I do not think we can speak on foreign policy with multiple voices.

So far as we can do it, our foreign policy should be handled by the State Department, a permanent and continuing organization. Even if it is a little difficult for it to take over some economic aspects of the program, I still believe that the State Department should meet that responsibility and take it over. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for his concise and straightforward answers.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the distinguished Senator from Montana has clarified the situation. He was wise to bring it up. I appreciate his doing so.

I should like to say further that not only do I agree, but I want it distinctly understood that it is my own feeling, as well as the feeling, as I interpret it, of many members of the committee of which I have the privilege to serve as chairman—and I am referring to Republicans and Democrats alike, because there is no partisanship exhibited in the committee—that we are giving of our substance and we are putting a terrific drain on the American taxpayer and upon the economy of this country, and therefore we must make sure, and increasingly so, that our aid is channeled to the places where it will do the most effective good for the mutual defense of the United States and the free world. We must emphasize that fact, as well as the fact that we look with some question on some of the programs of the past. Therefore we must make it plain that so far as the committee is concerned, unless that is done it will be increasingly difficult to get the support of the committee and of the Congress and of the American people to a continuation of the program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I could not agree more thoroughly with the distinguished chairman. I am delighted to have his answers, and the answers of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on

Foreign Relations to similar questions raised earlier in the week. I am satisfied that on June 30, 1955, if not sooner, FOA will be on its way out.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, that the bill, as proposed to be amended, be considered as an original text for the purpose of amendment, and that no points of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, may I say to the distinguished chairman of the committee it is my understanding that alternative language will be offered as an amendment with respect to section 108. To that there is no objection on my part. I wish to be sure that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is not foreclosed in his opportunity to offer such language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that after the adoption of the committee amendments the right of the Senator from Nevada to offer amendments, as well as the right of every other Senator, will be fully protected.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, after line 9, to strike out: "Military assistance: For military assistance as authorized by title I, chapter 1, \$1,341,300,000 plus unobligated balances, as follows: For general military assistance authorized by section 103, \$1,265,300,000 plus not to exceed \$2,234,912,729 (including not to exceed \$27,825,000 for development of weapons of advanced design as authorized by section 105) of unobligated balances; for infrastructure authorized by section 104 (a), \$76 million, plus not to exceed \$39 million of unobligated balances: *Provided*, That such unobligated balances shall be derived from balances of appropriations heretofore made for military assistance (Europe; Near East and Africa; Asia and the Pacific; American Republics; and mutual special weapons planning): *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$22,500,000 of such funds shall be available for administrative expenses to carry out the purposes of title I, chapter 1, until June 30, 1955."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"Military assistance: For military assistance as authorized by title I, chapter 1, \$1,392,700,000 together with unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for military assistance: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,932,092,283 may be obligated under this heading during fiscal year 1955, including not to exceed \$3,770,392,283 for general military assistance as authorized by section 103, and not to exceed \$161,700,000 for infrastructure as authorized by section 104 (a), and not to exceed \$24 million for administrative expenses to carry out the purposes of title I, chapter 1: *Provided further*, That the military supplies and equipment (or the equivalent value thereof as the Secretary of Defense shall determine but not to exceed \$200 million in inventory value) which have been procured and processed for delivery to foreign areas and which subsequently are returned to the custody of the United States because of a change in the international situation, shall remain available for military assistance authorized by law, and

such amounts shall be in addition to the amounts herein otherwise provided for: *Provided further*, That this limitation on military supplies and equipment shall not apply to capital ships for which title has passed but which have been reclaimed by the Navy Department."

On page 3, line 14, after "section 121", to strike out "\$712,000,000" and insert "\$700,000,000."

On page 3, after line 14, to insert: "Production for forces support: For assistance authorized by section 122, \$35,000,000."

On page 3, line 18, after "section 123", to strike out "\$64,000,000" and insert "\$60,000,000."

On page 3, at the beginning of line 22, to insert "as authorized by section 403."

On page 4, line 2 after "section 131 (b) (3)", to strike out "\$86,000,000" and insert "\$80,098,195."

On page 4, line 5, after "(c)", to strike out "\$200,000,000" and insert "\$205,000,000 and in addition, unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated under the head 'Relief and Rehabilitation in Korea,' in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, and unobligated balances of the appropriation under the head 'Civilian Relief in Korea' in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1954, are continued available for the purposes of section 132 (a) through June 30, 1955, and are hereby consolidated with this appropriation."

On page 4, line 16, after the figures \$3,000,000, to strike out the comma and "and in addition, not to exceed \$15,000,000 of the unobligated balances of funds heretofore made available under this head."

On page 5, line 3, after the word "section", to strike out "303" and insert "304", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$110,000,000."

On page 5, after line 4, to insert: "Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance: For contributions to cover the amount pledged by the United States for conducting the program during the calendar year 1954, \$9,957,621."

On page 5, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "305 (b)" and insert "306 (b)."

On page 5, line 14, after "405 (a)", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$10,600,000"; in the same line after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "and in addition, not to exceed \$500,000 of the unobligated balance heretofore appropriated for 'Movement of migrants';" and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "Provided, That no funds appropriated in this act or any other act shall be used to assist directly or indirectly in the migration of any person to any nation in the Western Hemisphere who shall not first have been thoroughly screened for security in accordance with standards identical with those standards contained in the United States Immigration and Nationality Act."

On page 5, after line 22, to insert: "Contributions to the United Nations refugee emergency fund: For contributions authorized by section 405 (c), \$400,000."

On page 6, line 2, after "section 406", to strike out "\$12,000,000" and insert "\$13,500,000."

On page 6, line 6, after the word "Agency", to strike out "Not to exceed \$23,063,250 of the unobligated" and insert "The unexpended."

On page 6, line 12, after "section 408", to strike out "\$3,169,000" and insert "\$1,169,000."

On page 6, line 18, after "section 410", to strike out "\$1,075,000" and insert "\$1,300,000."

On page 6, line 20, after "section 411", to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$34,700,000."

On page 6, after line 20, to insert:

"UNEXPENDED BALANCES"

"The unexpended balances appropriated under each paragraph of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1954 (except appropriations under the heads of military assistance and mutual special weapons planning) shall be consolidated with the appropriate appropriation made under this act, and shall be available for the same general purpose and for the same period of time as the appropriate appropriation made under this act."

On page 11, beginning with line 21, after the word "Act", to strike out "and notwithstanding the provisions of section 502 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, all expenditures of foreign currencies or credits for the purposes of such act shall be subject to the provisions of section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1953."

On page 11, line 11, after the numerals "1953", as proposed to be stricken out, to insert a colon and "Provided, That the proviso in section 502 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 is amended as follows: (1) Strike out 'Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives' and insert 'Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives'; and (2) strike out 'Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate' and insert 'Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.'"

On page 13, after line 9, to strike out: "Sec. 107. Funds made available pursuant to this act may not be used for the procurement of equipment or materials outside the United States unless the President determines that such procurement will not result in one or more of the following conditions:

"(1) Adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, or upon the industrial mobilization base, which outweigh the strategic and logistic advantages to the United States of procurement abroad;

"(2) Production of such equipment or materials outside the United States under inadequate safeguards against sabotage or the lease to potential enemies of information detrimental to the security of the United States;

"(3) Unjustifiable cost in comparison with procurement in the United States; and

"(4) Delays in delivery incompatible with United States defense objectives."

On page 14, line 5, to change the section number from "108" to "107"; and in the same line, after the word "than", to strike out "02" and insert "25."

On page 14, after line 7, to insert:

"Sec. 108. Of the \$700 million in surplus agricultural commodities authorized to be disposed of under provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, not less than \$55 million shall be provided to Spain during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That 95 percent of the foreign credits generated hereunder shall be used to strengthen and improve the civilian economy of Spain: *Provided further*, That the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be reimbursed for the assistance furnished under this section from unexpended balances available under the Mutual Security Act of 1954."

On page 14, after line 18, to insert:

"Sec. 109. Funds heretofore or hereafter allocated to the Department of Defense from any appropriation for military assistance (except funds obligated directly against any such appropriation for offshore procurement or other purposes) shall be accounted for by geographic area and by country solely on the basis of the value of materials delivered and services performed (such value to be determined in accordance with the applicable provisions of law governing the administration of military assistance). Within the limits of funds so allocated, the Department of Defense is authorized to incur, in applicable appropriations, obligations in anticipa-

tion of reimbursement from such allocation, and no funds so allocated shall be withdrawn by administrative action until the Secretary of Defense shall certify that they are not required for liquidation of obligations so incurred, or unless the President in writing shall direct such action. Reimbursement from such allocation shall be made in accordance with the applicable provisions of law."

On page 15, after line 11, to insert:

"Sec. 110. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this act shall be available from July 1, 1954, for the purposes provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1954, and the date of enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof and the terms of Public Law 475, 83d Congress."

On page 15, after line 20, to insert:

"Sec. 111. None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used to carry out the purposes of section 416 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954."

On page 15, after line 23, to insert:

"Sec. 112. Shipping on United States vessels: Such steps as may be necessary shall be taken to assure, as far as practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities, materials, and equipment procured out of funds made available under sections 103, 123, 131, 132 (a), 201, 304, and 403 of this act and transported to or from the United States on ocean vessels, computed separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liner and tanker services and computed separately for section 103, and for sections 123, 131, 132 (a), 201, 304, and 403 (taken together) is so transported on United States-flag commercial vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States-flag commercial vessels provided such rates are fair and reasonable; and, in the administration of this provision, steps shall be taken, insofar as practicable and consistent with the purpose of this act, to secure a fair and reasonable participation by United States-flag commercial vessels in cargoes by geographic area."

On page 16, line 17, to change the section number from "109" to "113."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, is the Senator from New Hampshire about to yield the floor?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. I wish to make it possible for other Senators to have the opportunity to speak in the regular order. I should like to proceed with the amendments.

Mr. HILL. I have an amendment to offer, with which I think the distinguished chairman of the committee and the other members of the committee will be in full agreement.

The amendment I desire to propose would appear on page 12, section 105. This is the section intended to prevent use of counterpart funds of all sources for payment of debts of recipient nations, or for any purpose so long as the recipient permits a dependency to violate United States treaties.

The language in the bill now prohibits the use of these funds for payment of debts of recipient nations, whether it be funds carried in the pending bill or in previous acts. The bill now takes care of funds in this proposed act, so far as any recipient permitting a dependency to violate a United States treaty is concerned, but it does not take care of the matter of carryover funds.

The amendment which I am suggesting would be to add the words "or any other act" on line 24, page 12, after the word "act." The language then would read, "under this act or any other act."

Mr. BRIDGES. On what page of the bill would that be?

Mr. HILL. Page 12, line 24. The language now in the bill prohibits the use of counterpart funds. The proposed amendment would take care of any carryover counterpart funds, exactly as we take care of the carryover counterpart funds in the first part of the section, which deals with the use of counterpart funds for payment of debts of recipient nations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think we should have a little time to examine into this amendment.

Mr. HILL. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, if the amendment is presented in the regular course, if there is no objection certainly the committee will go along with it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I might say that I have received a letter from the Secretary of State, which I have been trying to put my hand on, objecting to the general thought proposed. There are various other administrative officers who object to what the Senator is proposing. This action would affect them. I should like to have an opportunity to look at that letter and to study the amendment.

Mr. HILL. I shall be glad to submit the amendment to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. However, the bill now carries the provision with reference to counterpart funds. All this amendment would do would be to take care of any carryover counterpart funds.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I call up my amendment for additional aid for Spain, which I submitted yesterday, and which was ordered to be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 8, it is proposed to strike out section 108 and insert the following:

Sec. 108. Fifty-five million dollars of the unobligated balances continued available under this act shall be available only for the procurement and sale, in accordance with provisions of section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, of surplus agricultural commodities as assistance to Spain during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That the limitations on obligation of military assistance funds during fiscal year 1955 shall not apply to such assistance: *Provided further*, That 95 percent of the foreign currencies generated hereunder shall be used to strengthen and improve the civilian economy of Spain, the balance to be available for use of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this amendment differs from the original committee amendment only in that it provides that the surplus commodities will be made available under the provisions of section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, rather than under the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954. In my

opinion, this is a better and more orderly way of providing this additional aid, since all of the authority is contained in one law, which obviates the necessity of utilizing the provisions of the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954. My amendment carries the same amount of aid as the committee amendment. My amendment provides, as does the committee amendment, that this additional aid shall be in the form of surplus commodities and that foreign credits generated shall be used to bolster the civilian economy of Spain. This last provision is strictly within the authority contained in section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. In addition, my amendment provides that this will not reduce the amount that could otherwise be obligated for military assistance to friendly countries.

Mr. President, section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 provides in part as follows:

Foreign currency proceeds accruing from such sales shall be used for the purposes of this act and with particular emphasis on the purposes of section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 which are in harmony with the purposes of this act.

Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 has for one of its purposes paragraph (E), which reads as follows:

For promoting balanced economic development and trade among nations;

Therefore, Mr. President, what my amendment seeks to do in the last proviso is completely in harmony with both the Mutual Security Act of 1954 and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

I have every reason to believe that this substitute amendment will not be objectionable to the Foreign Operations Administration. I have been very reliably informed that officials of the Foreign Operations Administration would have no objection to additional aid for Spain and recognize that under present conditions the \$30 million provided in the estimate will not be sufficient. Apropos of this, Mr. Fitzgerald of Foreign Operations Administration testified on page 689 of the hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee as follows:

In addition to the unfavorable weather of last year, Spain early this spring, was very adversely affected by heavy frosts which did very substantial damage to the citrus crop. Citrus is one of the largest foreign exchange earners in Spain, and current estimates are that this sharp fall in the citrus crop will, during the next 12 months reduce Spanish foreign exchange by another \$40 to \$50 million a year.

Our recommendations in respect to economic aid, defense support for Spain for fiscal 1955 of \$30 million were developed prior to their frost.

Mr. President, the political situation in Spain is peculiar at this time due to the fact that the Spanish people are very much upset by the propaganda that is being spread by the enemies of the free world that the recently concluded agreements with the United States will simply result in Spain becoming a target for a Russian A-bomb. This propaganda is

becoming increasingly effective and was stepped up when word reached Spain through the press that American economic aid was to be reduced from \$85 million in 1954 to \$30 million in 1955. It is, therefore, imperative that the proposed 1955 amount be increased and that the increase go to strengthening the Spanish civilian economy. It is particularly important that any counterpart generated by this additional amount also be utilized for the same purposes. Only in this way can the Spanish people be given reassurance that the United States is truly interested in something more than using Spain as a base to launch air attacks on our enemies.

Mr. President, so as to not unduly take up the time of the Senate, I should like to summarize very briefly a few points which are pertinent to the consideration of my amendment. These points are as follows:

First. American bases in Spain will be permanent and in case of an attack on Europe will be among those which are defended until the last. This point has been insisted upon by members of the Appropriations Committee and by the chairman. Therefore it is vital that we should concentrate on Spain in all respects—of which the civilian economy is just one.

Second. FOA as of June 30, 1954 had \$2.6 billion in unobligated and unexpended balances. In addition, FOA has \$7.1 billion in unexpended balances—much of which can also become unobligated under the provisions of section 1111 in the 1955 supplemental bill. Therefore utilization of \$55 million of these balances for Spain will not interfere with the FOA program.

Third. Spain is a latecomer into the mutual security picture and therefore her civilian economy needs more emphasis than those countries which have participated in the economic aid program from the beginning. The bill provides funds to promote economic development and to assist in maintaining the economy of countries in the Near East and Africa; south Asia; and Latin America. The compelling reason for including economic aid funds for these countries is that they too must be helped economically if they are to perform their role in helping to retain the free world. This compelling reason for including these countries applies eminently to Spain in all respects.

Fourth. Spain by virtue of the agreements with the United States, which she freely entered into, does not enjoy the favorable treatment afforded other nations in the utilization of economic aid counterpart funds to bolster the civilian economy. We have poured billions in economic aid into France and Italy and both are unknown quantities today as to whether they will go Communist or not. In Spain we have a known quantity—we know that not only will she not go Communist, but that she will stand by our side to the end in the case of an attack by the Communist world.

Fifth. It is vital that the Spanish civilian economy be bolstered by some direct economic aid so that the Spanish people will see that the United States is interested in something more than making Spain a target for an atomic bomb.

Spain now has one of the lowest standards of living and per capita income of any country of Europe.

Mr. President, my amendment would not require the appropriation of additional funds, but would result in the utilization of existing balances, and the aid would be in the form of surplus commodities. The counterpart generated would be used to bolster the civilian economy of Spain. With the civilian economy improved, with a strengthening of the Spanish military forces and with United States bases, Spain will stand as a bastion against any onslaught on Europe by the Communists.

Mr. President, this amendment, although small in amount, is vital to the eventual defense of the United States. I hope, therefore, that the Senate will approve the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has the Senator from Nevada completed his argument on this amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may say, with respect to this amendment, that it does not increase the amount which would be available for Spain. The amendment would be limited in its provisions entirely to surplus commodities. However, this action would cause the amount to be taken from the unobligated balances in the pending bill, rather than having it charged to the \$700 million fund under the agricultural trade development and assistance program. I believe this is a better legislative technique. I think I can say on behalf of the chairman that we would be glad to accept this language, with the understanding that if it does require some additional modification, that could be done in conference.

Mr. McCARRAN. I might say the original amendment was adopted by the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is only a perfecting amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. It is in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. This matter was discussed previously in committee hearings and in committee study. I believe it is a very sound approach not only for the purpose of aiding and strengthening the Spanish economy, but also for effecting a saving for our own United States Treasury. For that reason, I hope the committee will most certainly accept this amendment as a part of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question with regard to the provision appearing on page 5, lines 5 through 8, which reads as follows:

Contributions to the United Nations expanded program of technical assistance; For contributions to cover the amount pledged

by the United States for conducting the program during the calendar year 1954, \$9,957,621.

Since I shall be serving as a member of the United States delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations this fall, I am very much interested in the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations on the administration's request for the United Nations technical-assistance program. I note that the committee has allowed \$9,957,621 of the \$17,958,000 authorized for the program for fiscal year 1955. I understand this is to cover the amount pledged last year by representatives of the United States to the United Nations for the calendar year 1954, for carrying out the multilateral program. No funds are provided for the calendar year 1955.

I should appreciate having the distinguished chairman of the committee clear up certain language in one paragraph in the committee report, which I do not fully understand. The language is as follows:

This appropriation is made with the understanding that no further pledge shall be made to the United Nations for the expanded technical-assistance program by any representative of the United States Government without prior authorization by the Congress of the United States.

I am entirely in accord with that statement, but I desire to be certain as to its meaning, so that those who are planning to attend the General Assembly this year can be governed by the interpretation made by the chairman of the committee.

Am I correct in assuming that at the conference which is to be held at the United Nations this fall during the General Assembly, the United States representative may tentatively commit the \$8 million already authorized in the mutual security bill for the first half of the calendar year 1955, subject to the appropriation of funds?

Mr. BRIDGES. As the distinguished Senator from New Jersey knows, the House did not include 1 cent for this item; it completely outlawed the item. Feelings in many parts of the country are strong on this matter, judging by the protests which have come to our committee and to the House committee as well. So the Senate committee included \$9,957,621 to cover the amount pledged by representatives of the United States to the United Nations during the remainder of the calendar year 1954.

Beyond that, we have indicated our intention during the interim to study the situation and the various elements which enter into it, so that as of the first of the year we shall be prepared to pass more intelligently and accurately on the necessity for the rest of the authorized amount.

The matter about which the committee and a great many other persons in Congress are concerned is that it is not desired to have representatives of the executive department, or their successors or predecessors, who will attend the United Nations meeting, pledge something which will commit Congress and the country to expenditures, until the respective committees of Congress, and Congress itself, shall have had an opportunity to pass upon them. I am cer-

tain that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, able and skilled as he is, who will soon represent our country in the United Nations meeting, will understand that.

We realize that the representatives of the United States must examine the situation and must explore the possibilities, and reach perhaps a tentative formula or arrangement for the coming months or the coming year. But the committee desires to have leeway left, so that it will not be faced with an accomplished fact. We want to have plenty of latitude in which to explore requests for appropriations when they are submitted to us. We do not desire to have representatives of the executive department come before the committee and say, "We have pledged this sum," and then say nothing more.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The difficulty arises from the fact that the United Nations operates on a calendar-year basis, not on a fiscal-year basis. When the United Nations budget is prepared, it is well in advance of the time when Congress begins its work on appropriation bills. The United States member of the Budget Committee of the United Nations then makes his commitment. I have always contended that if his commitment were considered to be good, Congress would actually be surrendering its power over the purse. That was the reason for including such a provision in the bill, with the understanding that the pledge which has been made for 1954 will be fulfilled. We can continue with the pledge for fiscal 1955. Then in January the whole matter can be considered in more detail by Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Then, so that the situation can be made perfectly clear to the United Nations, it might be considered that the authorization is already in existence, under the act passed this year, for the first half of 1955. That authorization must be acted on by the Committee on Appropriations.

I thank the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Illinois for their exposition of the matter. I think it is important to have it in the Record, so that when we are in attendance at the General Assembly, we can explain the limitations on our power to commit the United States.

THE SO-CALLED MUTUAL SECURITY—FOA—A TRAVESTY ON THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I think it is time that the United Nations and the nations of Europe understood that Congress is responsible for the appropriations—not Mr. Stassen and not Mr. Dulles; and it is time that Members of Congress understood that they are responsible to the taxpayers of the Nation for the appropriations they make.

Congress should stop all gifts and grants to foreign nations, and stop persons who have no responsibility, who are not elected, and who are not responsible to Congress, to commit the taxpayers and the Congress to foreign nations throughout the world without a

return of any kind, not even loyalty or friendship.

I intend to vote and work against this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to announce that I shall suggest the absence of a quorum and ask for the yeas and nays when my amendment is reached.

APPRAISAL OF THE NATION'S AIR-POWER PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Saturday afternoon the senior Senator from Massachusetts, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee, talked on the floor. He spoke on an appraisal of the Nation's airpower program.

I was in Tennessee at the time, but have now gone over this appraisal, one which concerns perhaps the most vital of all the grave problems facing this Nation today.

In fact, it would now appear that the very survival of the free world depends largely upon the strength and adequacy of its airpower—Air Force airpower and naval airpower.

Recent events in Indochina have confirmed a now familiar and unhappy fact: we are not going to try to contain communism.

Certainly we are not going to try to contain this evil on the ground.

How, then, do we propose to contain it?

Unless we have airpower superior beyond question, what other means is at our disposal for halting the advance of Communist forces when they decide to march again?

The senior Senator from Massachusetts stated his was a "calm and objective appraisal" of the airpower program.

It was calm—so calm, in fact, I was reminded of the rosy optimism which prevailed in 1950, just prior to the outbreak of the Korean war.

In the talk last Saturday there were many reassuring words to the effect we now have the best of all possible air forces, in the best of all possible worlds.

There was scarcely any mention of the ominous and growing Red air force, or the rising worldwide Communist threat against the security of the free world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Based upon the knowledge of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri concerning Air Force problems—and I doubt if there is any person in the country, let alone any Member of the Senate, who knows more about them than does the Senator from Missouri—could he state his estimate of the number of Russian planes which could come through and deliver their bomb loads on American cities and targets if a Russian air Pearl Harbor should start tomorrow?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, not only for his gracious remarks, but also for allowing me an opportunity to answer his wise question. I do not believe there is anybody who thinks that less than 90 percent of the planes which

would attack this country today would get through our present defenses.

Mr. MORSE. I want to thank the Senator from Missouri for that answer, because when I was a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I never heard a top American Air Force official ever fix the number at less than 60 percent. In my judgment, the speech of the senior Senator from Massachusetts last Saturday, and the newspaper stories that were based on that speech, had the very detrimental effect of giving the American people a false sense of security. The point that the Senator from Missouri has just made is that the American people need to know how false that sense of security is. As long as our air experts continue to deceive the people into believing that only from 60 to 75 percent of those planes would get through our defenses, I cannot be counted among the Eisenhower supporters in connection with the Eisenhower air program, because, in my judgment, this administration should have moved forward at a much more rapid rate than it has done in order to protect the security of this country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, nor was there any mention whatever of the increasing Soviet stockpile of atomic and hydrogen bombs. Nor was there mention of Soviet progress in long-range guided missiles; missiles which, in a few years, will be able to reach this country directly.

On reading this appraisal of airpower by the Senator from Massachusetts, for whom I have great respect, one would think that the only threats against the security of the United States were long ago and far away.

Again, I agree the appraisal was calm—so calm as to appear to be concerned with events in another planet; so calm, in fact, as to appear almost self-complacent.

I cannot agree, however, that the Senator from Massachusetts' appraisal was either objective or nonpartisan. Most of it apparently was designed to criticize the program of the previous administration, which called for a rapid buildup, and to praise the present administration's program of a slow and leisurely buildup.

Much of the talk listed all the advantages which can be gained by slow and leisurely procedures which have, and will, postpone by several years the attainment of that airpower everybody now considers necessary for the defense of the United States.

It is true, of course, that the program of the previous administration was an emergency program. The emergency came as a result of this country finding itself at war on the mainland of Asia against Communist Korea and Communist China, supported by Communist Russia.

It was a program begun when a mere handful of modern F-86's possessed by our Air Force was heroically standing off hundreds of Russian-built MIG-15's.

At that time a great sense of urgency inspired the leaders and the people of this Nation to do a big job and do it fast.

Of course, there was a certain amount of waste involved. There were slippages,

and modifications, and other difficulties which inevitably result from handling any production problem with extraordinary speed.

But, Mr. President, once a new program is well established such difficulties subside; and this was already the case when the present administration came in about a year and a half ago.

As General Vandenberg stated many times in early 1953, by that time aircraft production had ceased to be the major problem facing the Air Force. The major problem was personnel.

The Senator from Massachusetts stated last week that the Air Force program was out of balance in 1953. That is true. The debate on the budget a year ago showed it to be true.

The Air Force was doing fairly well in the production of aircraft, but was having trouble getting its bases built on time, and was having trouble obtaining and holding sufficiently trained skilled personnel.

One of the principal reasons why the program was out of balance, as the debate of a year ago brought out only too well, was the fact this administration had held up or canceled many base construction projects.

The principal difficulty in personnel arose because the new administration imposed an arbitrary manpower ceiling which prevented the recruiting of thousands of new men a month at a time when these very men were seeking to join the Air Force, and as a result of that ill-considered action the Air Force is critically short of personnel today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall when the administration, more than a year ago, made a \$5-billion cut in the air budget?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall that as a result of that cut, a large number of men, including a large number of pilots, were let out of the Air Force, and they were told by the Air Force that the reason they were being let out was because of the cut in the budget?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall that a great number of those men were not reservists, but were men who wanted to make a lifetime career out of their Air Force service, and that by letting them out the result was bound to be that when they were replaced later on they would have to be replaced, at least in part, by reservists who had already served their stint?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I had a great many conferences at that time with many of those men, because when I was on the Committee on Armed Services, I served on a subcommittee that dealt with military personnel, and I continually fought to better the condition of the military personnel. I fought to develop a program within the Military Establishment that would encourage men to come into

the service for a career, and relieve the reservists of this country from being brought into military service after having served their stint.

I think one of the most unfortunate things that happened as a result of that cut in the Air Force, from the standpoint of the personnel problem, was that it resulted in letting out of the Air Force a great many needed pilots, and a great many men serving in personnel capacities, who should have been kept in on a career basis. I am glad the Senator from Missouri is pointing out the personnel problem in this particular speech.

At that time I conferred with Air Force officials in the Pentagon building. They said, "Senator, you are completely right about this as a matter of principle and policy, but there is nothing we can do, and we are not going to come out publicly and make an issue out of this, because, as good soldiers, we have to go along; but we wish you were still on that committee, fighting for the personnel problem as you did when you were on that committee."

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I join with the many who believe that the Senator from Oregon would have made a great contribution if he had been allowed to stay on the Armed Services Committee. Yes, the program was out of balance and the actions taken by this administration forced it still further out of balance.

In one respect at least we are holding our own with the Communists. We can pat ourselves on the back about as effectively as they can.

We can cut our Air Force budget by \$5 billion, cut its personnel program by a quarter of a million people, cancel more than \$2 billion in airplane contracts, and still boast that these actions are increasing rather than decreasing our total air strength.

The Russians may boast they invented the adding machine, but surely they can do no better than claim subtraction is really addition; and that we have added to the strength of our Air Force by cutting away from the previous program money, bases, planes, and people.

It was one thing to say, and I quote from the talk, "the most important development in national defense at this time is air power," and another to reduce steadily appropriations for air power, to cut down the procurement of aircraft, and to hold the Air Force below an artificially imposed ceiling on manpower.

The talk of last Saturday even went so far as to claim that everything possible is being done, and that funds are not the limiting factor.

To me, this is a strange argument, indeed. It is the responsibility of the Congress to provide funds for the national defense. To say we have provided all the funds which could be used profitably is an incredible statement.

We are not matching some of the progress of the Communists, either in quantity or quality, of airpower, despite the fact the Russians do not have a productive base that in any way is comparable to our own.

As example, there is no question that the Communists are catching up with us in the development and production of

long-range jet aircraft. Yet, according to this recent talk, there is nothing more this great Nation can do to hold its lead.

Everyone knows that if we become involved in a war tomorrow, even in another relatively minor war, such as Korea, we would be forced to make far more effort than we are making now and would begin by appropriating more funds.

That would be first. It is the first thing we would do today to speed up progress in the building of our airpower.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope the Senator from Missouri will not refer to the Korean war as a minor war, in view of the very great number of casualties our troops suffered there, and also in view of the great sums of money we spent in connection with that war. Of course, subsequently, in Indochina, the United States paid half the French expenses.

So I trust that the Senator from Missouri will not refer to the Korean war as a minor one.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I referred to it as a "relatively minor war." I thank the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina for his comment. He is entirely correct in that it was a very serious war. I used the term "relatively minor" only because I was differentiating it from a global world war.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that I have the utmost respect for the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri, the former Secretary for Air. I have called his attention to that point only because I thought the Korean war was a major war, and, furthermore, because I think the blunders made in connection with it will lead to future troubles of a most serious sort.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his contribution. I believe the Korean war was a major war, and I am glad to have his observation and help on that subject.

The Senator from Massachusetts contends that the proposed buildup to 137 wings is big enough, and will be completed quickly enough, to keep us safe and secure; and he supports this contention by citing the position of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

But I find that the present Chief of Staff of our Air Force recognized from the very outset that this 137-wing program was somewhat optimistic.

Many months ago General Twining gave early warning that if the Communists continued their efforts to overtake us, we would have to revise our air-power plans.

Since that time, new and more powerful Soviet aircraft have been unveiled, and I have heard no one assert that there is any evidence the Communists have slowed their efforts toward air supremacy.

Without going into detail on the appraisal of air power presented by my distinguished colleague, I in turn present several points in his address which would

appear to be misleading—points which I believe can produce an unjustified and dangerous sense of security if allowed to pass unquestioned.

The Senator from Massachusetts calls attention to the fact that "the number of combat wings is the same, but the composition of the force has been significantly altered. The number of air defense wings has been substantially increased."

But he fails to mention that the number of offensive wings has been decreased by an equal amount.

This is truly significant. The significance is that the increase in Russian air striking power has already forced us to somewhat shift our own emphasis from offense to defense.

Such a trend can be fatal in warfare. It was fatal to the Nazi Air Force in World War II.

When the Nazis cut down their bomber production in order to concentrate on defensive fighters, as General Spaatz has often said, he and his staff knew the Nazi fate was sealed; because you do not score while you are on the defensive. All you can do on the defensive is postpone defeat.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator from Missouri has mentioned General Spaatz, for whose knowledge I have a very, very high regard, not only in respect to his knowledge of American airpower problems, but also in respect to his knowledge of airpower throughout the world. I read with a great deal of interest his articles, which are printed periodically in the newspapers and magazines.

Am I correct when I say that General Spaatz has, through his pen and also through his lips, continuously warned the American people that the decline in aircraft construction in the United States does not augur well for either the defense of the United States in case of attack or for a successful offense in case of war?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Oregon is entirely correct. Since the death of our late great air general, H. H. "Hap" Arnold, our highest ranking living air general in World War II is General Spaatz. All I can say is that if some of the policies of this administration with respect to airpower are correct, then General Spaatz does not know what he is talking about and General Spaatz is considered a genius on airpower.

Mr. President, we have added wings to our defense by subtracting wings from our offense. But everybody knows it is offensive power that turns the balance. Surely no one should take comfort in this development.

The Senator from Massachusetts quotes the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs as saying that United States national airpower is superior to that of any other nation. While this statement is supportable in some respects, it is danger-

ously unsupportable in others; because the important fact, not mentioned by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], is that the Reds have more than half again as many planes assigned to active combat units as the United States Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marines, combined.

This fact has been well known for some time. Recently efforts have been made to obscure it by counting all the trainers, liaison craft, and sometimes even the civil-reserve transport fleet, as a part of the United States aircraft inventory.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for another question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that when we listen to statements such as that made by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in which it is said that our national airpower is superior to that of any other nation, that general observation fails to take into account the points of weakness of our airpower in case of an all-out war; and it is those points of weakness which really endanger the success of the United States in case of a war?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Oregon is entirely correct.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, am I correct in my understanding that if we were to get into world war III tomorrow there would be little hope that we could provide Europe with the air defense which Europe would need in the first few days and weeks of that war—with the result that great strategic points in Europe, such as England, Germany, and, for that matter, France, undoubtedly would be subjected to such devastating attack that it is doubtful that they would be of much use to us within a few weeks after the beginning of the war?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I prefer not to answer categorically that question of high strategy; but I would say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that, especially after the trip the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I took over Europe, last March, I believe what the Senator has said is correct, based on the air strength now available on the European Continent. England is in a somewhat better position.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from Missouri, and I have no intention of eliciting from him, or disclosing, as a result of my own knowledge, certain facts; but in my judgment in this case we are dealing with the lives of Americans and with the security of our Nation, and I think the American people need to be awakened to the importance of our giving the support that is needed to build up a true air superiority.

I direct the Senator's attention to that last phrase. Do we not have to face the fact that true air superiority for the United States requires true air superiority in Europe as well as in the continental United States?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that. The more airpower the free world has, the greater the strength of the free world.

Mr. MORSE. The last question I wish to raise, then, is this: When we are talking about American air strength, is it not necessary that our airpower program be correlated and coordinated with the airpower of England and the rest of our allies so that we can protect the security of Europe from successful attack from the Russians as well as protect the United States?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe the farther away the launching point of any attack by any possible enemy, the greater the security of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. One more question: Does it not obviously follow that if Russia is allowed to develop superiority in striking power so she can quickly subdue Europe, the security of the United States will be greatly endangered if we then have to stand against Russia alone in any air war?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I believe the Senator from Oregon is correct. Although I am not criticizing in any way the mutual security program which will shortly be further discussed by my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I should like to point out what is in effect a paradox; namely, at the same time we are contributing billions more to other countries, we are now carrying out our program of cutting our own air strength many billions of dollars and hundreds of thousands of men.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Arizona, especially because I know of his great experience and authoritative knowledge on matters of airpower.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The remarks of the Senator from Oregon prompt this question: At any time during his long experience with the Air Force has the Senator from Missouri known of any plans that conceived the mission of the United States Air Force as not including the defense of Europe?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The mission of the free world, as developed by the President, the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States, and the leaders of other countries, has to the best of my knowledge, always embraced a joint effort involving the protection and security of the United States, Europe, the British Isles, the North African littoral, and other free-world countries, especially since in most of those countries we now have our own air-planes and troops.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not true that the program was begun under the management of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, that is, that we cooperate with the countries of Europe in their continental defense and that we coordinate our aircraft production with theirs? For instance, the defense of England requires interceptors; the defense of the continental United States does not require the same type plane. We have not overlapped in production. I believe that coordination was started under your program. Is that not true?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I am not sure I could give a categorical yes or no answer to his question; but I shall get the facts

and present them to the Senator, even if I cannot do it this afternoon in sufficient detail or accurately enough.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I understand correctly the question of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I am perfectly willing to make this comment, and I think it can be done within the proprieties. I have inspected, I believe, a majority of American air bases abroad, in Europe, and the Arctic, and I have inspected a great many of the airbases of our allies. I thought it was generally understood that under NATO the program is to have a joint coordinated air offense and air-defense program in case of a war with the Soviet Union. One cannot conduct the inspections and the investigations that I participated in as a member of the Armed Services Committee and not be aware of the fact that we cannot approach our air defense in this country without taking into account the air program of our allies, because in case of war it becomes a unified program.

I think it is very true that when we come to decide what the appropriations in this country shall be for our airpower, we must take into account the allied air program. Unless the allied air program is kept strong, we are just cutting off our own defense nose. Of course, if the impression ever gets abroad, in England, France, Germany, or in any other of our allies that we are going to take a singular nationalistic approach to airpower, then I think we are playing right into the hands of the Russians, because we will create great doubts in the minds of our allies as to whether or not they can count upon us to execute the coordinated program which has been the program—at least I have assumed it has been—up to this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that point?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield for a question to my distinguished colleague from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, would the Senator from Missouri say there is anything nationalistic about the mission of the Strategic Air Command?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The mission of the Strategic Air Command cannot be described as nationalistic or internationalistic.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Would it tend to be more internationalistic than nationalistic in its original concept?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If we were attacked, the citizens of my State of Missouri would believe the retaliatory effort of SAC was nationalistic; and, as the planes of SAC proceeded to avenge an attack upon us, the citizens of, say, a free European country would consider it internationalistic.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator for that comment. I gathered from the remarks of the Senator from Oregon that he might have felt that airpower or air superiority was being interpreted a little differently by the Eisenhower administration, whereas, in effect, it is merely a continuation of what has been

the interpretation of airpower since World War II.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. It has always been my understanding, as I think the RECORD will show I said in my previous remarks, that we recognize the importance of an air program coordinated and correlated both offensively and defensively, with that of our allies. I had sought to bring out earlier in my remarks that it happens to be my judgment that the cut in the budget for airpower under the Eisenhower administration, to which the Senator from Missouri is now directing his remarks, was a great mistake, because it weakened our own defense here at home and, in my judgment, it weakened our position abroad and the position of our allies as well, as far as airpower against the Russians is concerned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree entirely with the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question, and then I shall let him continue his very interesting discussion.

Is it not true that this very day we are better equipped to take care of our international air problems than we were a year ago or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 years ago?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is a question which I hesitate to answer in detail, because I am taking too much time. However, I am glad the Senator asked it. We were down to 42 groups just prior to the Korean war, and at that point—which, incidentally, was the point at which I left the Air Force—this country was in a serious state of unpreparedness. I have always said that, and I am glad to restate it. Nevertheless, the fact we are steadily increasing our air strength, and have been ever since the early summer of 1950, is not the important point.

The important point is the relative increase of our strength as against the relative increase of strength of the airpower of the evil rulers of the Kremlin. It is true that today we are stronger in the air than we have ever been in peacetime; and I believe it is also true that we are stronger on the ground. On the other hand, that is not the important point. The important point is the relative strength of our air, sea, and ground forces as against the only known enemy to the free world, the Communists.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What I wanted to bring out was that the basic strength of the United States Air Force today is in the Strategic Air Command. I do not believe that anyone can argue that the Strategic Air Command has not done a commendable job all through the buildup over the period of years, around the globe, so that we can accomplish the stated mission of our Air Force.

The relative strength of the Air Force of the Soviet Union and of the Air Force of the United States can be tested only in one place, and the Senator from Missouri knows as well as I do that that is the ultimate battlefield of the air.

The figures which the Senator from Missouri discusses and the figures which

I discuss—and I think they are approximately the same—could be used to argue either way.

I thank the Senator for allowing me to interrogate him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona for his contribution. He has had great experience in the field of airpower, and he himself was a well known and famous member of the Air Force during the war.

The strength that would count today at the beginning of any possible war is combat strength—strength in being—ready strength.

Efforts to obscure the disparity in combat strength between this country and Russia by including other types of aircraft are misleading and dangerous.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts states that if the original 143-wing program had been continued "a sudden and drastic reduction in aircraft production would have followed to the point of practically closing down the industry."

To me, as one who has had experience in manufacturing, this statement hardly makes sense.

The aircraft production required to sustain 143 wings would be the same regardless of the time when the 143 wings were attained.

Then the Senator from Massachusetts states that the percentage of wings in the highest category of combat readiness has improved by 70 percent over March 1953.

This is an interesting figure. It implies that the Air Force has improved its readiness to a startling degree.

Now let us look at the facts.

Since the rate of wing growth in the Air Force has been slowed down, but the delivery of airplanes has continued, of course there has been some improvement in the readiness of existing units.

But lest the American people be misled, let me introduce another statistic: In the two lower categories of readiness there are just as many Air Force wings as there were in March 1953.

Let us not becloud this grave issue further by offering up tricky statistics.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts who has been so consistently interested in our problems of national defense.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to compliment the Senator from Missouri, because for the past 18 months he has been the strongest voice in the United States Senate in favor of building up our air strength and in opposition to the idea of a stretchout.

In the speech made last Saturday by my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, mention was made of the relatively low level of obligations for aircraft and related procurement during the first 10 months of the past fiscal year. The fact is that in fiscal 1953 the Defense Department total of obligations incurred for aircraft production and procurement was \$11.7 billion. But for fiscal 1954, this fell to an estimated \$1.4 billion. Can we expect this tremendous drop in obligations incurred of an estimated 90 percent, dur-

ing fiscal year 1954 in comparison with the 3 previous years, to result in anything but a drop in 1955 and 1956 and 1957 in the rate of aircraft production and deliveries in the United States?

Is it not a fact that this lag in new obligations is going to have a tremendous effect upon the number of aircraft available in 1956 and 1957?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about it, and I thank the Senator for his gracious remarks.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that under the Truman-Lovett budget, it was estimated that we would get about 800 aircraft a month through 1954 and 1955, and that then it would drop to 300 a month; but that under the proposed schedule it has been stated that we are now getting about 500 a month, next year it will drop to 400 a month, and at the end of 1957 it will be 200 a month? Is not anyone who says we are going to be in better shape in 1957, than we would have been under the Truman-Lovett budget, just ignoring the plain, harsh facts of our aircraft production?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I honestly do not know about those figures. I have never seen them, as they are now being presented by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts. However, I will say that these figures follow the overall pattern of a concerted reduction in our airpower and in the strength which comes from the production of modern airplanes.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would say to the Senator that I think it is inevitable, even though these figures may be changed in coming years—and there has been a recent upturn—and that this tremendous drop of an estimated 90 percent from fiscal 1953 to 1954 in the new obligations incurred for aircraft will have a debilitating effect on our airpower and its readiness in the next 2 years, years which will be very vital years to our security.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator again for bringing out these facts.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

The truth is that the Air Force is making progress, but both its progress and its growth have been slowed down.

Has the progress and growth of the Red Air Force been slowed down?

Therein lies the great and growing danger.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts asserted that production of such new plane models as the F-100 supersonic fighter, the B-52 long-range bomber, and the B-66 short-range bomber are proceeding satisfactorily.

Well, he is easily satisfied, because now it is common knowledge that Soviet Communist production of comparable new types of aircraft is improving faster than ours.

As example, we have far fewer F-100's than the Communists have MIG-17's; and thousands fewer B-57's and B-66's than the Reds have IL-28's.

Now as to our modern long-range bomber, the B-52, should we boast about its production in this fashion, when we have produced exactly 3, including 2

prototypes. Prototypes are not generally considered production aircraft, and they should not be. They are generally "hogged out" on engine lathes in the toolroom and by special temporary dies.

How many B-52's would this recent talk make you believe were now in the hands of the Air Force?

The fact is only one.

Inasmuch as there has been a great deal said about the production of B-66's, let us ask how many B-66's this talk would make us believe are now off any productive line and in the hands of the Air Force?

The fact is none.

Does this record justify any such statement that the production of our modern fighters and bombers is proceeding satisfactorily?

While we coast along on the impetus given our program in 1951 and 1952, the Reds are driving relentlessly and are coming up fast.

If these figures are true—and I challenge anyone to dispute them—where is the satisfaction?

Now as to perhaps the most important question of all for the future—long-range missiles.

The chairman of the Armed Services Committee says that in this category also everything possible is being done. Although I have great respect for my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, I cannot agree, and I am certain that even a casual investigation would prove that we are not even close to an all-out effort on intercontinental missiles.

In view of the evidence that the Communists, with all their difficulties and deficiencies, and with all the defects of their system, are nevertheless at least even with us in the development of guided missiles, how can anyone say that we are doing everything possible?

To say that is, in effect, to admit defeat.

No, I cannot accept as accurate this recent estimate of American airpower.

That estimate would seem to find nothing but satisfaction in slowdowns, stretchouts, arbitrary manpower ceilings, and reductions and cancellations of contracts.

That estimate leaves out of account the steady growth of Russian airpower, against which, always, our own strength must be measured.

Anyone following current world events knows that we need adequate airpower today, and may need it even more tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that as one citizen of the United States I am deeply grateful for the warning he has presented to the American people in his brief speech today. What he is saying to the American people is, "Do not be deluded by the wishful thinkers, and do not be deluded by false promises; do not be deluded by those who, just before an

election, are trying to give you the impression that everything is going well."

The fact of the matter is—and I do not think there can be any successful disputing of it—that if we get into an air war with Russia tomorrow we can be badly hurt, for the reason that we are not in a strong defensive position. When we talk about the Strategic Air Command and the long-range bomber command we need also, it seems to me, to warn the American people that they are not secure unless we have a superiority by way of a defensive program as well as an offensive program.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Missouri for warning the American people today that it is in our interest to spend what we need to spend in order to get ourselves into a striking position.

I have said during the past 3 years, or longer, that I am perfectly willing to waste—and I repeat it—to waste millions of dollars, if necessary, in building up an air power that may be obsolescent in 5 or 6 years or sooner. I am perfectly willing to waste it, because I think it is the kind of waste that can be justified, for the reason that if we should have another Pearl Harbor tomorrow we shall be mighty glad we were willing to engage in that kind of waste, because the question is, Do we have the planes now to answer the testimony given to us in regard to what would happen to us if Russian bombers came over, as we know they would come through, for the most part, and deliver their loads? That is why I have been proud of the record I have made as a member of the Armed Services Committee in calling for a faster buildup of our airpower than we had under the Truman administration. I do not think we have gone fast enough in building up the striking and defensive power of our American Air Force.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who has always been, as the Record clearly shows, a true champion of air power for the United States and the free world.

I had not intended to give another address during this session regarding our airpower defense. I am sure the senior Senator from Massachusetts, did not intend to mislead the American people in his address last Saturday, but I felt that his talk might cause the American people to think we have a stronger Air Force today than we actually have.

The important question also is, When can we have an adequate Air Force? If we had it tomorrow, in my opinion, it would not be too soon.

Mr. President, those in authority have the duty to give the people all the facts about our relative military position as against that of the advancing Communists.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, always a champion of adequate air power.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for calling the attention of the

country to the dangers we face in failing to recognize the superiority of the buildup in Communist air strength. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the much vaunted savings by the so-called great economizers in the Cabinet have come mainly out of our national security expenditures?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is my belief. I should like to add to my distinguished colleague that I would not have been interested in making this presentation today except for the fact that approximately 19 months after this administration took office, and approximately 17 months after the decisions were first made, some people are still attempting to justify the tragic cut in our air power around a year ago last March. In the words of the great bard, "Methinks they do protest too much."

Mr. MONRONEY. It is claimed that we have a great deal stronger Air Force having cut \$5 billion out of it, which would tend to lead the people to believe we were wasting at least \$5 billion scheduled for expenditure. That, of course, would not be justified in the light of the facts. We have that much less air power because of that precious 1 year which has been lost in the buildup of our air strength, and it will perhaps take us 1 or 2 or even 3 years to recover from the loss of this production, the loss of testing prototype aircraft, and, above all, the loss of personnel in the mechanical and flight fields of our air forces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Above all, if I may add, in the development and operation of the Air Force which we all know and everyone agrees is necessary for the security of the United States—that Air Force has now been postponed for at least 2 years.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the Senator has just said, the fact is that by 1957 we shall not have as good an Air Force as we would have had in 1955.

The only question, therefore, is whether in 1954, 1955, 1956, and 1957 world events will move in such a peaceful direction that we can afford to postpone a maximum buildup of our air strength. It seems to me, considering the events in Indochina and the increasing tempo of the Communist advance, that it would be to the vital interest of our national security to build up our maximum air strength as soon as possible. We have no real defense against an aggressor's air attack. The only defense is to build an air power second to none which will serve as a counter to any possible Communist attack.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is entirely correct. I note in this afternoon's newspaper a report that there are 100,000 Chinese Communists opposite Formosa. I do not know what the policy of this Government will be tomorrow if Formosa is attacked by the Chinese Communists. But I wish our Air Force could be built up by tomorrow, instead of by 1957, to that size Air Force the previous administration planned to have in 1955, and the present administration plans to have in 1957.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator has concluded his remarks, I wish to say that I was glad to hear the Senator from Massachusetts make the remark which I think the American people should realize, that there is no absolute defense against an air attack. We saw that in the battle of Britain. I think it is wrong to tell the American people that by building tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of planes we can guarantee the American people against attack by Russian planes. The emphasis has been shifting from tactical airpower to strategic airpower. I do not think the Senator can deny that the strength of the Strategic Air Command today is superior in its carrying capacity and striking power to what was planned for 1954, under the plans we had in 1950 or 1951.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with the Senator, but I point out that of the 6 groups cut out when this administration went from 143 to 137 wings, some offensive groups were cut out in order to provide additional defensive groups. The figure cannot be disclosed because of security, but there were groups taken out of the Strategic Air Force.

I completely agree with the Senator that this reduction in that category was a mistake.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Strategic Air Command is our common defense in terms of the offensive type of warfare today. In the case of airpower, just as it was in the old days of the cavalry, the best defense is the strongest offense; the one "who gets there fastest with the mostest" in the way of bombs and fast-bombing equipment will win the next war.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I know the Senator from Arizona has given a great deal of thought to this problem, and I should like to discuss it with him at some future time—because we are both intensely interested in the subject.

However, I have a problem, in that I am only speaking now, prior to the speech of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], because of his typical gracious courtesy in stating I could talk at this time. Inasmuch as there has been considerable participation in this discussion, which I did not know would be the case, I have taken a great deal more time than the Senator from Illinois was kind enough to allow me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I only hope there will come a time when the Senator from Illinois will have an engagement he must meet, and I shall be in a position to allow him to precede me. It will be done with great pleasure.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will yield to the Senator from Oregon for one more question and to the Senator from Montana for one more question. Then, because of the time already taken I should like to yield the floor to my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Missouri agree with me that although to a degree we cannot prevent enemy planes from attacking, nevertheless when it is still reported that a minimum of 60 percent of such planes would come through in case of an air Pearl Harbor tomorrow, we can develop a better defense than we now have, so as to reduce that number? Every plane we stop means the saving of American lives; is that not true?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question about that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the Senator has kindly yielded to me, I just wish to compliment the Senator from Missouri upon his giving us the benefit of his well-thought-out observations on the present air situation and air strategy as it affects our country and the free world. I believe we in the Senate are extremely fortunate to have in the junior Senator from Missouri a man who has served as Secretary of the Air Force, a man who knows what he is talking about. I think the Senate and the country as a whole have been well benefited by his remarks made here this afternoon, and I wish to express my personal thanks to the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Montana for his typical courtesy. There is no one more concerned about our airpower.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I have discussed the talk of my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present to my colleagues the fact the Senator from Massachusetts this morning knew I planned to discuss his address of last Saturday this afternoon. I only regret that because of the Senator's other heavy duties in the closing days, as chairman of our committee, and a member of the Appropriations Committee, he was not able to be here for all my presentation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should be very glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Missouri did call me this morning and I did get a copy of the speech, which I read. I had to attend the meeting of the policy committee, and therefore I could not listen to the entire speech.

I am glad to have the thoughts of the Senator from Missouri, even though some of the comments may have been just a little bit cynical regarding some of the things I said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the typical graciousness with which the Senator from Massachusetts presents his criticism.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator in charge of the bill desire to take up an amendment on page 5, line 16?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would rather not yield until a later time for that, because I thought it might be rather novel to have a few observations on the bill which is before the Senate. I wished to talk to the Senate about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thought the chairman made all the novel observations that were to be made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, since this is the vesper hour, and since it is Saturday afternoon and the spirit is willing but the flesh is a little weak, I shall try not to detain the Senate too long. However, I wish to allude to the fact that this foreign-aid program, which began in 1948 with the address of Secretary Marshall at Harvard, was intended, of course, as a 4-year program, and early emphasis was upon economic aid and economic relief. I believe the RECORD will show that in 1948 the amount of economic relief which was provided under the so-called foreign aid bill was \$4.4 billion.

In the instant bill, Mr. President, there is only \$184.5 million for economic relief. Therefore, calculationwise, really only 4 percent of the amount we made available for economic aid in 1948 is carried in this bill for fiscal year 1955.

There is a reason for that very sharp drop in amount, and it is because production in the European countries and elsewhere, according to the figures which have been submitted to the committee, is about 1½ times prewar production. So in consequence there has been new vitality and new production in the countries which we esteem as a part of the orbit of the free world and in our corner in respect of this whole pattern of security.

This program began as a military program and as an economic program. Subsequently, the so-called technical assistance program was added.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Illinois has participated in all of the hearings, and has done an excellent job. I desired to ask the Senator if, when he finished his remarks, it would be agreeable to the other side of the aisle for me to call up my amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am afraid the Senator from Illinois has no control over that matter. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] a moment ago, when he desired to offer his amendment, yielded until at least some general observations on the bill could be made.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course I would wait until my distinguished friend from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] had finished.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Since I am a member of the committee, and there are a number of amendments to be offered, and, since some other Members have asked me if I intended to offer them, I wonder whether I could be recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say that at the end of my remarks I had intended to offer four amendments, which were clarifying or administrative in character, and to which I am sure there is no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I should certainly be in favor of the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois, as a member of the committee. I wondered

if there were other amendments to be offered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Beyond that, may I say to my very distinguished and cultured friend from South Carolina that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is also a member of the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. He certainly is.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from South Carolina is also a member of the committee. The Senator from Nevada also desires to offer an amendment. That is a matter to be decided by the very distinguished Presiding Officer, I may say.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I have talked to my good friend, the distinguished member of the committee from Nevada, and I am certain it will not take him very long. I hope it will not.

Mr. McCARRAN. So do I.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So, Mr. President, this program began as an economic program and as a military program. To it was subsequently added the so-called technical-assistance program, which is designed to teach people in other countries of the world something about our advances in the fields of agriculture, health and sanitation, mining and industry, and other fields, so that other peoples of the world will have a full-functioning economy of their own.

As this program was launched, obviously as hope springs eternal in the human breast, there was a hope that at long last aggression might cease; that those whose sinister shadow falls upon the world today might become more amicable in their relations with other countries. But that hope seems to have gone by the by, since hostilities ended 9 years ago this month. So we find now that it becomes necessary to put the emphasis on the military aspects of what is known as the foreign-aid program, so I wish to suggest, Mr. President, that the right term for this program is the mutual-security program.

Like other Members of the Senate, I receive a good many letters decrying the fact that this is a giveaway; that we do not want to make sacrifices on the part of our own people for the benefit of people abroad. I am inclined to the conviction that many people are forgetting that the whole emphasis in this program today is virtually on its military aspect.

This is the 7th year of this program. We can follow 1 of 2 courses. We can either build up entirely at home and build a wall around our own country, or we can follow the theory that perhaps we can keep other countries integrated in a military pattern which has an approximate and direct effect upon the security of the United States of America.

While I know that there is a good deal of hostility to this program in some quarters, I view it sheerly from the so-called security pinnacle. For that reason, after hearing all the testimony—Mr. President, I do not believe I missed a word of testimony, on or off the record, in connection with this bill—I certainly am in full accord with the bill which has been reported to the Senate for final approval.

Now, I think I ought to point out what the estimates first fashioned were in comparison with other years.

In 1953 the estimates were at \$6,012,000,000.

In 1954, they dropped to \$4,337,000,000.

In 1955, the estimates for new funds were \$3,438,000,000.

In the bill itself, after the committee got through, we finally recommended new funds aggregating a little less than \$3 billion.

So it can be said that we have reduced the amount from the 1953 estimate by roughly 49 percent. That is not only a very substantial reduction, but I think it gives some hint to the country and to the Congress itself that no pains are being spared, and every effort is being made, insofar as it can be done consonant with the military security of the United States, to diminish gradually what is known as the foreign-aid program.

In respect to the estimates that came, which were submitted, I believe it should not be forgotten that the man in the White House is a very distinguished soldier. He was the commander in chief of our forces in Africa long ago. He was the commander of the invasion forces in 1944. He was the Chief of Staff for General MacArthur in the Philippines many, many years ago. He is the Commander in Chief, under the Constitution, of the Armed Forces of the United States. The Constitution places in his hands the sword, while it places in the hands of the Congress the purse of the Nation. So it is fair to assume that a very distinguished soldier, who has had such a storied military record, would go to the military intelligence agencies, to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and to every competent and authoritative agency in Government, for the purpose of getting the best information he could obtain on which to predicate estimates that deal with a program like this, in the interest of our national security.

His attitude and his viewpoint have been implemented pretty well by a galaxy of witnesses who appeared before the committee, and who, beyond all doubt, can testify with authority. First came the Secretary of State, who is charged with the direction of the foreign policy of this country. Then came Admiral Radford, a very distinguished military man, who presently serves as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I was insistent that General Van Fleet, who has spent several weeks in the Pacific, Korea, the Philippines, Okinawa, Formosa, Japan, and elsewhere, should come, and, if it conduced to his equanimity and piece of mind, to testify entirely off the record.

There was something very persuasive and convincing about the testimony of the man who was the commander of the Eighth Army in Korea, to whom credit must be given for having whipped into shape the Army of the Republic of Korea, and to whom great testimony was paid by the President of the Republic of Korea when he addressed a joint session of the Congress not so long ago.

What we bring before the Senate today are the estimates of responsible agencies of Government, and those which

were testified to by witnesses who are competent to speak in this field.

I may point out, for the purposes of the RECORD, that when the conference committee on the authorization bill completed its labors, it set a ceiling of roughly \$3¼ billion on the items for foreign aid. When the Senate Appropriations Committee had finished its labors, the amount was cut to \$2,990,824,816. That is a little less than \$3 billion. The House provided an amount of \$2,895,944,000. So the bill as reported to the Senate is only \$95 million in excess of the amount contained in the House bill.

That is quite a difference from the action taken by the respective Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate last year, when there was a disparity of \$1,015,000,000 when the bill went to conference.

I may say that the amount contained in the Senate version of the Senate bill is \$448 million below the estimates, and \$1,541,000,000 below the amount provided in the bill for 1954.

This job would not be complete unless at least we spell out some of the items in the bill. When this measure was in the markup stage in the committee, I started at the bottom and proceeded to the top. I did that for a reason. First, action on the conference report on the authorization bill had not been completed. Secondly, I find it is always easier if first we clear away what might be called the undergrowth, so that one can get his teeth into the larger military items in the bill. The undergrowth, if it can be called that, although that is not too happy and felicitous a term, would start with chapter 4, the first item of which deals with money for the migrant and refugee problem in Europe.

In 1954 the so-called Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration handled about 118,000 migrants. In 1955 the program calls for handling 155,000 migrants, who will be taken from a number of countries in Europe, and then, under this program, funneled out to other countries, some of which are in the Western Hemisphere.

I thought the amount we allowed for that purpose, on the basis of the testimony, was adequate, and at the same time not too much in order to take on this additional workload and get the job done.

There is one item of \$500,000 in the bill for what is known as emergency migration problems or refugee problems, which are handled by the United Nations. While the amount is modest, it deals with 37,000 destitute cases. I suppose they have surveyed the field and found that number of cases of families in utter destitution. It would not be seemly for the charitable and throbbing heart of America to look unkindly upon a modest request if it is going to bring relief to people who are in very abject circumstances.

Then there is an item under the miscellaneous heading which has always had great appeal to me. It is one that deals with child welfare. We would contribute roughly 68 percent of the amount of that item, which is a United Nations under-

taking. Thus far some seventy-odd countries have had the benefit of that program. What they are doing mainly, of course, is setting up certain centers that purvey medical care for children who suffer from malnutrition. The program is now reaching approximately 60 million children. It is the kind of thing that regenerates hope about the future.

I was happy to read the other day that former President Hoover stated that the thing that kept him young was his interest in children.

When I was in Germany some years ago I saw evidences of the esteem in which the school children there hold former President Hoover. They called the program *Hooverspeisung*. That is a good mouth-filling word, I know. I noticed pictures the children drew and verses they wrote in eloquent tribute and testimony to a former great President of the United States, who observed his 80th birthday at West Branch, Iowa, this week, and who became an honorary citizen of the Commonwealth of Iowa by action of the Iowa Legislature. What a marvelous thing. Certainly his interest in the program of child welfare everywhere in the world should not be displaced.

After he came back from a tour of the world, I went to dinner with him. I found that his hearing had become bad in one ear. I said, "Chief, you have been flying too much at high altitude," and he had. He had gone abroad in connection with the program at a time when the weather was so severe—there was no fuel—that he had to wrap himself in blankets so he could go about the business of looking after the children's program in Europe in the darkest days of the winter. So that great citizen carried on.

What we shall do will be in a way testimony to a great throbbing and charitable heart who laid the foundation for that child-welfare program. As I said, the program will reach about 60 million children. While the centers which have been set up—there are some 53 of them—by our standards certainly would not be very much, in certain countries there are no health centers at all, and those established under this program come as a great boon and blessing to humble people.

One item in this bill deals with those who are referred to as Palestine refugees. It is a bit of a misnomer because in the main these refugees are Arab refugees. It is estimated there are approximately 850,000 of them—475,000 in the little country of Transjordan alone—a much impoverished country which, obviously, could not carry the entire impact without some aid from the outside. The testimony showed that approximately 200,000 of these refugees are in Egypt, and approximately 100,000 in the little country of Lebanon, on the Mediterranean, and approximately 80,000 in Syria. God willing, the Jordan River development will be underway within the next few years because water is like life to the land in the Jordan Valley; and for miles and miles, not only in Palestine but also in Transjordan and elsewhere, there will be, as a result of the Jordan River development, a place where these people

can subsist because the land is fruitful, indeed, if water can be brought to it.

So this provision of the bill is really in relation to Arab refugees who today are dispersed in that section of the world.

One item is for \$3,169,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That includes roughly one-half of their expenditures, and the other half is our contribution to a new NATO headquarters building in Paris. It appears that the headquarters there are occupying temporary quarters, and that under the Paris building code the buildings must be razed some day soon. But they have been there quite a while, and perhaps they can languish there a little longer. So, in the interest of economy—slight though it may be—the committee finally decided to delete the \$2 million for the new NATO building in Paris, which is our contribution out of a total of \$5 million.

There is \$4,400,000 for ocean freight. That is not for governmental shipments particularly. It is, rather, for shipments by either voluntary groups or by groups under Government supervision, who send packages both at Christmas time and at other times in the year, so as to renew the faith of people in all parts of the world, and to let them know there is really a Christmas spirit all the year around, rather than just in connection with a "binge" at certain times of the year. This money is also to be used in connection with packages sent by such groups as Hadassah and other groups which send relief to the Middle East and other areas.

Mr. President, at this time I must refer to one matter which seems to have elicited considerable criticism. Four typical American couples were sent abroad, to see how this package shipment program was working out. Administrator Stassen was roundly criticized for it. The fact is that those persons were not remunerated; they received only a per diem allowance and their traveling expenses.

But when I considered the desirability of surveillance of the results of this program, I could not think of a better way to proceed than to have some typical American families, from good, solid homes in America, make a factual survey, on the basis of being told, "Go there, take a good look, and come back and report to your neighbors." That was done and the expenditure involved is set forth.

As a result, we have obtained firsthand information regarding the program for which we hope to receive credit in the form of good will on the part of the peoples of those countries. Under that program, parcels are sent to those lands in colored bags bearing the inscription of the Foreign Operations Administration. I think that program causes people everywhere in the world to testify to the fact that America is indeed a country with a great, charitable heart, that does not look with a steely eye upon the needs of peoples elsewhere.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Illinois has touched on the question of certain citizens of the United States who

went abroad to check on the Christmas-package program, and to investigate the distribution of the packages, and to acquaint the public in foreign lands with what the American Government was endeavoring to do for the destitute and the underprivileged and the needy children of the world.

Last December, when I was returning from Korea and Indochina, I passed through the city of Rome, Italy. Because of the tight schedule I had, it was necessary for me to have breakfast before 7 o'clock, one morning; and, by chance, at that time I met some of the Americans who were making the check-up to which the Senator from Illinois has just referred. I did not know they were to be there. But in the course of conversation with them, they gave me a report of what they were doing and what they had learned and what they had found to be the attitude and reaction of the families, including the children, both in Rome and in other parts of Italy, to the Christmas packages the United States Government had made available to the destitute, the underprivileged, and the needy children of that country.

I wish to commend the Senator from Illinois for his able explanation, not only of this phase of the program, but of the entire program.

Of course, this is Saturday afternoon, at the end of a full week. However, it is most worth while for us to devote time this afternoon, even though it be late in the week, to receive the report the able and distinguished Senator from Illinois is giving us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am deeply grateful to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. President, for his generous observations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, to permit me to make an observation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield for an observation, if it is in the nature of a question.

Mr. WILEY. I wish to say that I, too, have been very much uplifted by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I am happy to know that the presentation he is making, with his wonderful ability at description, of the mutual security bill, will be available to all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Certainly it will be a complete antidote to the "rathole" philosophy to which reference has been made.

He and I know that \$1 billion spent in Turkey for military defense will provide 20 times what it will provide in the United States. We also know that the package shipments to which the Senator from Illinois has referred are begetting appreciation, understanding, and a feeling of warmth toward America—an attitude which, in itself, is mutual security.

So I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for the splendid presentation he is making; and if copies of his speech are printed and are made available for distribution, I should like to purchase about 10,000 of them, to send to certain parts of my own State, where the people have been told that this is a "rat-hole" operation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. Perhaps the best justification for thus trespassing on the grace of the Senate on a Saturday afternoon is that I, too, have encountered some criticisms of the program. So I thought the true story should be told.

Mr. President, the bill also carries funds for the administrative expenses of the Foreign Operations Administrations. I wish to state briefly the situation regarding the present personnel. When Governor Stassen took over, I think the personnel were in the neighborhood of 11,000 or 12,000. According to the latest report, United States funds are now being used for 3,109 administrative personnel and for 3,282 other personnel, whose principal function is in connection with technical assistance, and also in connection with the administration of what is known as Battle Act aid—in other words, aid in connection with the control of shipments of critical and strategic materials to certain friendly nations. So the total personnel paid out of United States funds are 6,391. That number is made up of 4,212 United States nationals and 2,179 nationals of other countries. In addition, 2,372 are carried on the rolls in connection with the funds obtained from foreign countries, the so-called counterpart funds; and their services are necessary in connection with the administration of so far-flung a program as this one.

Mr. President, that, in the main, covers the items in title IV of the bill.

Now moving from the bottom to the top, we come to title III, which deals with technical assistance. The official title is "Technical Cooperation Administration." The bill carries an item of \$110 million for this purpose, of which \$28,500,000 for Latin America. I may say that today we have sent abroad just a few less than 3,000 technicians, who are carrying on the business of teaching other people the know-how, so that their own economies and their own cultures can function better.

It should be pointed out, Mr. President, that these are participating programs. We do not initiate them. Foreign countries must initiate them, and then they participate, and we participate with money, supplies, and technicians. They cover, for instance, agricultural projects, health and sanitation, education, transportation, industry, mining, public administration, and in some cases, community development.

The largest amount of this \$110 million fund made available to any country is the \$19½ million which goes to India. That country, with about 370 million people, is carrying on a program of community development. Having coursed and toured through India a good many years ago, I know how necessary that kind of program is, if the living standards and the health standards of that country are ever to be improved, and an amicable and sweet relationship developed between India and our own country.

The smallest country in this category which receives technical cooperation assistance is Guatemala, which receives only \$190,000.

So between \$19,500,000 at the top, and \$190,000 at the bottom, there are approximately 40 nations which share in this program. Since it is mutual, since they participate along with us, I think I can see already from the testimony that a great deal of benefit and good have resulted. This is one of the programs which is on rather substantial grounds.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. It was my good fortune to visit India last fall. I went to India primarily in order to acquaint myself with this technical assistance program in the field. I visited several outlying areas of India, flying into the area in order to save time. I found American county agents—men from Iowa, Minnesota, and other States of the Union—who had brought the youth, the young men, into central educational centers, some erected in the countryside and others in connection with some of the educational institutions of India. They were teaching the youth to become leaders, to go forth into the communities of India and bring about an improvement in health measures, sanitation in the villages, water sanitation, and also to develop some of the American know-how in the field of agriculture and livestock husbandry.

I left that country with the positive feeling that we were doing much to secure for our country the good will of India, developing good relationships and understanding, aiding India to develop its food production, and to develop sanitation to guard its children and its population in general against the many diseases that ravage the country.

Mr. President, if ever I had the satisfaction of feeling that we were actually accomplishing something by the dollars spent, I felt it then. I felt we were doing it in India, as well as in Pakistan and the other countries.

The Senator from Illinois is ably presenting here this afternoon what we have accomplished with the dollars appropriated for the technical-assistance program, and I am, indeed, very pleased and happy that he is devoting the time to make this known to us, as well as to make it known to the citizens of the United States, who are taxed in order that funds may be made available for the technical-assistance program.

We are making progress, and we are doing good. I believe we are achieving far more than we could possibly achieve by putting the same amount of money into our national defense in the form of weapons of destruction.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can testify to the devotion and application of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and who has always taken an interest in this matter, and given it very sustained attention.

Under title III, there are 2 other items. One is a modest item. For the organization of American States the bill carries \$1½ million to do an equivalent kind of work.

The other item requires some amplification, I think, because Members of the Senate have been pretty well belabored with letters and telegrams in connection with the so-called multilateral technical cooperation which is carried on by the United Nations. There was a request for seventeen-million-and-some - thousand dollars to carry that on. That request represented the pledge of this country to the United Nations for this work in 1954, and an equal amount to carry on their program in 1955.

The committee wrote in amendatory language, and allowed actually only half of the amount, on the theory that we were willing to pay the pledge for the current calendar year, but would require that they come back to the committee with some data with respect to their program for the next calendar year. Early in January, when the new Congress convenes, I am confident their program will receive careful attention.

Mr. President, the difficulty arises from the fact that the United Nations is on a calendar-year basis, and we are on a fiscal-year basis. When their budget committee meets, we have present a representative who, at least in theory, commits this country. Then the following January or February or March representatives appear before the Appropriations Committee, and we are confronted with a commitment.

Over and over I have declaimed the fact that this procedure amounts, in effect, to a surrender by the Congress of the power of the purse, and I will not recognize it as a legal, legislative, or moral commitment. I think the committee has now made that abundantly clear.

So under this program we will pay the pledge for 1954, and tell them to come back for the funds which they may require after they have done their planning for calendar year 1955.

One question has been raised because of the fact that this might be duplication of our own program, which is bilateral in nature, between 2 countries, instead of multilateral with the United Nations in the picture. I believe there is one reason which can be assigned why perhaps this ought to continue, namely, that there are, after all, countries which, in the feverish world of today, are a little timid, a little fearful about accepting gratuities or help from this country, on the theory that ultimately it might involve them in difficulties. I can understand that.

The distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] was in Burma a year or more ago. Burma was one of the countries that did not want to accept this aid. The people there are living in a very fluid orbit, and I think one can understand the timidity that springs from the dangers which beset a small and somewhat defenseless country. They can accept it from the United Nations, whereas accepting it from this country might cause them some embarrassment. So I am quite content to go along with this program, and I think we have dealt realistically with it and have done our full duty thereby.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the next item, because it bears the rather

euphonious title of "Development Assistance." That is a good, mouth-filling term, and it might fool people.

It reminds me of the story, Mr. President, about a young man who made an application for an insurance policy. In the application was a question which asked, "How old was your father when he died, and of what did he die?" Unfortunately, his father had been convicted of a heinous offense and he was hanged. The young man did not want to say that in the application for the policy, so after puzzling over it he finally wrote, "My father died at age 65. He came to his end while participating in a public function, when the platform gave way."

So we call this development assistance. This is the part which is so commonly referred to, Mr. President, as economic aid. This is the handout part of the program, if anybody wants to call it that.

In 1948 this item was \$4,000,000,000. Anyone who examines the bill will discover that we have reduced the amount to \$184,500,000. That is 4 percent of what the economic aid, or handout, was only a few years ago. Of what does it consist? There is \$9 million for Bolivia. We do not find much testimony in the record, because so much of it was off the record. But the fact is that when tin prices fell so sharply one of our sister republics of South America was feeling the strivings and heavings of economic instability, and conditions looked very dangerous—and sometimes even that kind of fever in our own hemisphere can give us trouble—that there was included, in the bill \$9 million for development assistance to Bolivia.

In addition, there is included for Iran and Egypt and Israel and the Arab States, under Near East and Africa, \$115 million. I point out to Members of the Senate that nearly one-half of it will be liquidated in the form of surplus agricultural commodities. In that way we kill 2 birds with 1 stone. We make provision for people who have the need, and at the same time we relieve the pressure that we have been encountering as a result of the towering stockpile of farm surpluses which only within the last few days has challenged and taxed the mental agility of the Senate in its efforts to deal with it.

Finally, in this item there is economic or development assistance for South Asia. That includes only one country, and that is India, for which the bill carries \$60,500,000. We should remember that India is a country of about 370 million people. We have provided her with no military assistance. Of the \$60½ million, roughly \$40 million will be in the form of agricultural surpluses.

My understanding is that with her own resources India is at the present time undertaking a 5-year program that aggregates roughly \$4¾ billion. I earnestly hope it will be consummated, because, as one looks on the Ganges River and the Indus River, or any other river, one realizes that, if the power of those rivers can be harnessed for the production of electrical energy, or impounded into reservoirs and fed to the soil, that great resource can bring beneficence to

an ancient country such as she has never experienced before.

This is a mere modicum of help.

Of course, I am not insensible to the fact that the Indian delegate to the United Nations has on a number of occasions registered a vote that I did not like and which was not particularly to the liking of the United States of America. However, here is a huge country in the Orient, rather mystic in a way and rather esoteric in its approaches, and there is some necessity for patience in dealing with her, because she can be a great power for good in the days that lie ahead, especially so when the horizons of Asia are already fitful with threats and warnings as to exactly what may happen.

That disposes of Title IV—Miscellaneous Provisions; Title III—The Technical Cooperation Program; and Title II—The Development Assistance Program. That brings us to title I. I suppose I ought to start at the bottom if I am to remain in character, and instead of starting with chapter 1, I shall take up chapter 3 of title I, because that deals with defense support.

The definitions in connection with this bill were always rather nebulous in my mind, and throughout the hearings I stressed to the witnesses the necessity of giving us a better definition of what the terms "direct force support" and "defense support" mean.

Defense support refers to common use items which feed into the general economy of the country and do some general good, and are necessary to the support of troops but not directly so. They shore up the economy of a country, and in so doing give vitality to its military effort.

There is involved \$45 million for Europe, of which \$30 million is for Spain, some of it for Yugoslavia, and a certain amount for the joint control area of Berlin.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], I believe, has offered his amendment with respect to this particular item, which I believe would increase the amount for Spain. That is quite agreeable to the committee.

Under the same item of defense support for the Near East, there is a total of \$73 million. That includes nearly all the supplies and agricultural products—meat, wheat, sugar, and so forth—for Greece and Turkey and Pakistan.

I merely wish to say one thing about Turkey. She is integrated into the NATO program with Greece and Yugoslavia. Only recently a mutual defense pact has been developed among those three countries. It is much to our advantage that Turkey is at the end of the long, looping arc that starts at the northern end of Norway and goes all the way through Europe and down around the Golden Horn to the tip of Turkey and up to the Black Sea. That constitutes the NATO defense perimeter in Europe. Turkey, of course, will be important in the scheme of things.

She gave a splendid account of herself, as did her troops in Korea. I believe we are fortunate that there has been such robustness and vitality in the thinking and in the faith of Turkey that she has stood up so sturdily, although

she is in a very delicate area, which involves the Dardanelles and the access from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean.

Some money is carried for the Far East, which includes Formosa, the Philippines, and Indochina.

The other item under this broad heading of chapter 3, title I, deals with the Korean program. The authorization which was completed this week when the conference report was approved, places a ceiling of \$205 million on this program. The budget estimate was for \$230 million. The committee allowed the entire amount authorized, namely, \$205 million.

This then is the United States effort in the field of reconstruction and rehabilitation in Korea, as distinguished from UNCURK, which is the United Nations effort. I was in Korea only a little while ago, and I say this is the least that we can do for some 22 million people who live in the concentrated area in the southern part of the country.

I have seen the slums of Pusan and the hundreds of thousands of children. I know those children will have a chance in the world only with the constructive hand of a great and wealthy country like the United States. Otherwise, I would despair of the future of Korea.

What we propose to do with this money is to divide it almost evenly between capital expenditures and expenditures for food and supplies. In the field of capital expenditures there will be irrigation equipment and fishing boats. If that seems strange to anyone, I can only repeat my statement to Syngman Rhee on the portico of his summer home at Seoul last year, when I said, "You have got to get to the salt water for the protein to give your people energy. To go to the salt water means that you must have fishing vessels in order to supplement your protein diet."

Likewise, Mr. President, they need generating equipment to catch the waters which come down from the high crevasses to produce electric power.

Then, of course, they need fertilizer so they can not only improve but augment their rice and barley crops, upon which they must subsist, and possibly become an exporting nation in the future.

Of course, something must be done for housing.

Let me add one other thing, Mr. President. There is tungsten in Korea, and a fine deposit of anthracite which can be sold to other countries of the Orient for steelmaking purposes.

The United Nations Reconstruction Administration has a participating function, to which we contribute 65 percent of the total amount. They have asked for only a small amount of new money and for a reappropriation of the unobligated balance, amounting to \$18½ million.

So we are participating in the reconstruction of Korea, first, by a bilateral program in which we can take pride because it is under good leadership and in sound hands.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I arrived in the Senate when the Senator was discussing the Latin American item in the bill, and I heard him talk about \$9 million for Bolivia. As I recall, there is an amendment sponsored by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. Can the Senator tell us what happened to that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a rather painful story. The Senate had approved the inclusion of \$10 million for Latin America. The Senate responds to our sister Republics to the south. But when the conferees took the authorization bill and, for reasons unknown to the humble Senator from Illinois, suddenly set a ceiling of \$5 million in the authorization, that is as far as the committee could go, and that \$5 million is included in the instant bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will indulge me briefly, let me say that I do not believe the national administration as a whole understands the situation. I believe that the Congress of the United States does understand the situation of Latin America in the present emergency. I hope that the standing committees will in the future, outside of giving a little lip service to our so-called good will and our so-called friendship for Latin America, realize that our future is based on our standing in the development of Latin America. There is no particular reason why we should provide \$20 million for Egypt in order to build public works in the way of irrigation systems, and at the same time not help to the extent we should to develop the countries to the south of us, which, if they could ever get dollars, would spend them in the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not mean to leave the impression that there is only \$5 million for Latin America, because the whole amount is \$28.5 million. I had particular reference to the action of the conferees with respect to the authorization of the amount which was contemplated by the very distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. President, I now go to chapter II, and pretty soon I shall get to the top of the page, and so we shall end this lesson.

Chapter II of title I deals with southeast Asia. There was an authorization of \$700 million, and an appropriation of \$700 million in new funds in the fiscal year 1954. There is \$745 million carried in the bill, and it is estimated at \$800 million for fiscal 1955. So we carry \$100 million below the estimate. I think our total aid to Indochina in 1955, of which this appropriation, of course, is a part, is estimated at \$1,133,000,000.

We now come to something which somehow intrigues Members of the Senate, and I can understand how easy it is to get into the frame of mind that here is a good place to cut, that here is a good place to sink the economic ax deeply. I would warn my brethren in the Senate about this, because I speak from the testimony of Admiral Radford, who knows the situation thoroughly, the testimony of General Van Fleet, the testimony of the Secretary of State, the testimony of General Stuart and others, and also, Mr. President, on the basis of my own observations in the Orient, ranging all the way from Korea into China, and farther, a little over a year ago.

The truce has been signed. The terms are rather vague and nebulous. There is a mystic line marking the limits. We have military stores and equipment in warehouses and depots. With hostilities at an end, no planes in the air, no howitzers and 75-millimeter guns belching death, how easy it is to say, "Let us pull out a few hundred million dollars."

My distinguished friend from South Carolina, I understand, proposes to offer an amendment to that end. I trust the Senate will resist it, for the very good reason that this money, under the flexible provisions of the authorization act, is available for all the purposes of the Pacific and southeast Asia. One need only to scan the front pages this noon to learn that 100,000 troops are alleged to be on the other side of the Formosa Straits, and they are allegedly equipped with jet planes. War has been going on there, Mr. President. It is not something that is going to linger and simmer for a while and then suddenly come upon the world, engendering apprehensions and fears on our part.

When I was there, the nearest island to the Chinese mainland had been shelled at a range of 2,500 meters. There are six divisions of hardened Chinese troops there. They are hardened, and they are fine soldiers. They are eking out an existence and getting along with rare fortitude, under the command of a general with a long, lean jaw, who said to me, "You should have been here yesterday." I arrived on Sunday. I said, "What happened?" He said, "We were shelled with 155-millimeter howitzers."

That is an explosive situation in the Pacific, Mr. President. Troops are all up and down the Chinese coast. We do not see it on the front pages of the newspapers, but it is an explosive situation, and it is very easy, in the tranquillity of this Chamber, suddenly to give vent to a certain spirit and say, "This is a good time to save \$200 million."

Let us not do that. We have a great American leader in the White House. We have a great leader in General Van Fleet. I am not at liberty to disclose for the RECORD the testimony, but I know what I have seen with my own eyes and have heard with my own ears. I know from my conversation with our leaders in the Orient; I know from the testimony which is very fresh and new, indeed, that this is a dangerous situation, and that pressure points can develop, not only in Vietnam, the southern part of Indochina, but in Laos, Cambodia, Burma, Thailand, Indochina, Formosa, and Japan.

So there must be latitude, and there must be funds for the purpose; because, who knows what the morrow will bring, when the sun comes up in the east?

I have made the point over and over again that, first, we must give our leaders flexibility. I have insisted on that. Secondly, we must provide them with adequate funds with which to do the job. I cannot imagine that men who with honor have worn the uniform of their country are simply throwing money to the birds; that they are spending it, as the proverbial expression goes, like so many sailors on a lark. Certainly not. But they must have adequate funds with which to deal with what is at this time,

perhaps, a most volatile situation all over the world.

I ask Senators to look at the map which has been placed at the desk. They will get a pretty good idea of what I am talking about. There is shown a line which somehow divides the non-Communist world from the Communist world.

First, let us look at the population total for males between the ages of 15 and 49. In the non-Communist part of the Pacific area, in the age group from 15 to 49, there is a population of 298,392,000, of whom 75,200,000 are males in the age bracket from 15 to 49. Of that number, how many are physically fit? Forty-five million two hundred and thirty thousand.

Next, look at the red figure, including China and her associated countries. What do we see? A Communist population of 530,260,000. The total number of males between the ages of 15 to 49 is 140 million. The number who are physically fit in that area is 74 million.

In the free world there are 45 million who are physically fit. In the Red world, the number of physically fit males available for military service is 74 million. The difference is 30 million.

There is a population deficiency with which the free world is confronted today. I could think of no more persuasive answer than to show that map to some who are beset with doubts, as Thomas was generations ago.

So how shall we fill the gap? The people of the Orient have obtained their know-how and techniques from us. They are just as adept in an airplane or sitting on the seat of an anti-aircraft gun, probably, as anyone we could provide. I never in my life saw more skillful pilots than the pilots who were trained in the good old days of Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa. I will ride with them any time. They were the backbone of Chenault's air force. They are the boys who ran the air transport from Taiwan to Hong Kong to the Haiphong Delta, in Indochina.

I had one of them bring me through the tail end of a typhoon when I was saying my prayers and thinking, "This is the end of the junior Senator from Illinois. Never will his feeble voice again be lifted in the Senate of the United States." I frankly did not expect to come back. But there sat a skilled Chinese major. As I saw him maneuver that airplane through the tail end of a typhoon, I saluted him; and when he brought us safely to land, I said, "My friend, you can serve in my air force any old day."

So they have the know-how in the Orient.

There, I say to the Senate, is the picture of the population difference. I will not restrict or tie the hands of our leaders and the very distinguished Commander in Chief of our forces at a time when reprogramming may be necessary, and a shift of emphasis may be necessary, in this direction or in that direction; because the situation is highly volatile. I could labor the whole situation in that area, but I see no point in doing so.

I wish to make one point, however, and that is in connection with any reductions in amounts. It is so easy to say that the

conflict in Indochina has ended; there are some things we have not used yet; other items are in the warehouses, probably packed in the original grease.

There are two besetting questions. One is that we have not removed the material yet. We have had our troubles in Korea. We may be able to evacuate a very substantial amount of supplies. If we are successful, there will be a good many places to put them, because there are small countries such as Laos and Cambodia, where the Red cells are already beginning, or a country like Thailand, where we see the penetrating, infiltrating efforts of the Reds. The material will have to be shifted. We do not know how much we shall be able to get out. So it becomes a conjectural, speculative figure.

I honestly hope the amount provided in the bill will not be reduced, and that we will not jeopardize and embarrass our military leaders; because if the money is not spent, it can be returned to the Treasury.

Let us not forget the recent visit of the President of the Republic of Korea. He was insisting that a greater effort should be made in this ancient country, in order that full independence and freedom might be achieved. Perhaps there must be emphasis in terms of weapons, money, and supplies for the defense effort, and to protect the forces which are there, over and above what may be contained in the bill.

So as we look at the long Asian front, which extends from the northernmost province of Japan, which is Hokkaido, where the United States has had a division for a long time, and go down the Pacific perimeter, and then go across the nebulous truce line which has resulted from the recent agreement in Europe, we get a better picture of the great area involved. If Senators have no idea about it, they ought to sit in an airplane sometime and fly all the way from Hokkaido along the Pacific coast. They would get a pretty fair idea, then, of the long line we are maintaining, and what it really takes to maintain it.

There is in the bill an item for production for forces support. That also is a part of the military title in chapter III. I seem to get my figures twisted, with respect to where I am in the bill, but I assure the Senate that I am still working from the bottom toward the top and I hope I shall not take too long. However, there has been some discussion about this particular item, because it relates to making surplus commodities available to Great Britain, so that she can have an offset amount of counterpart funds with which to produce front-line airplanes.

I like to be very cautious about the things I say and the amounts and estimates I use, in case they are wholly classified, but I think I can say that two programs are in operation. One is by agreement between the United States Air Force and the Royal Air Force. That is one program in itself.

But the program to which I am referring calls only for surplus commodities. It will make \$35 million available out of the counterpart funds of Great Britain for the purpose of producing

front-line fighters, as a part of the entire North Atlantic Treaty Military Organization.

A point was raised that this might make it possible for Great Britain to divert funds from her own budget, so that this amount, in a sense, would become a subsidy for commercial aviation in Great Britain. I think that argument can be made, but, in my opinion, it is so remote that I do not believe it should be too persuasive. I am more interested in getting fighter planes to the points where they may be needed. God willing, I hope they will not be needed; but, at least, as a part of the whole NATO structure, under the able generalship of General Gruenther, they will be available if they are needed.

Originally, this figure was set in the authorization bill at \$70 million. In this appropriation bill it has been reduced to \$35 million. So the only amount which can be carried in this bill for agricultural surpluses to be made available to Great Britain, in turn to be used for the construction of aircraft such as Canberra light bombers, Swift day fighters, and Hawker-Hunters, is \$35 million; and I think it is a worth-while expenditure at a time like this.

We come finally, Mr. President, to a few items in the second chapter. They are common-use items. I shall not labor them. They are for Formosa and Turkey.

I have already indicated my interest in Formosa, Mr. President, and I am confident that interest is shared at a high level, and that with anxious hearts and careful eyes the explosive situation in that area is being most carefully watched.

When we go to chapter 1 of title I, that involves, of course, the whole NATO picture in Europe. There are a few things I wish to say about that. This involves most of the military funds in this bill.

I said there is a line which starts away up in the northern part of Norway and swings around and goes to the eastern extremity of Turkey. That is the line which the North Atlantic Treaty Organization seeks to maintain. How is a line maintained, Mr. President? First of all, we have to have airfields. We have to have fuel lines. We have to have telecommunications of one kind and another. All of this costs a great deal of money. So all those items are carried under a very interesting word, and are called "infrastructure."

That is a good mouth-filling word which ought to frighten even a Senator. But, to break it down, "infra" means "under," so the infrastructure means the understructure. In the case of an automobile, it would be the undercarriage; so this is the undercarriage for the military-assistance program in Europe.

What does it embrace? Airfields. First, in the primary line; and, secondly, further back, for a second periphery, if that becomes necessary. That means fuel. That means equipment. That means installations and all the other things which are necessary for an effective and quickly functioning military structure.

So in the bill for that, Mr. President, there is carried a total of \$122.1 million.

I have little to say about the first item, the general authorization. General Gruenther spent the better part of a day with the committee, and in his informal and effective way he set forth what our responsibility was, what the limitations of his command were, and so on. Mr. President, we got a pretty fair idea of what we are trying to do and how skillfully and effectively we have done it.

Why have we done it? It is not to give things to people in European countries, but to keep a security line well beyond the shores of this country. It was done before. No alien bomb has so much as rubbed out a foot of concrete on an American highway. No alien or enemy bomb has destroyed a single dwelling in the continental United States. God willing, it will always be that way.

So I think, Mr. President, speaking for myself, I should be willing indeed to draw a containment line nearly 4,000 miles from home and say, "Call on us. We will help to hold them back behind that line and preserve all the vestiges of freedom in Western Europe." I hope that it can be pushed even further eastward so that the old idea and old principle enunciated even by Woodrow Wilson long ago, of self-determination for a humble people, may still become a reality in all sections of the world.

Let me say a word now about surplus commodities, Mr. President, to make the story complete. The Foreign Operations Administration was as good as its word, and for 1954 it actually made available and delivered \$245 million worth of surplus commodities. Their estimate for fiscal year 1955 is \$350 million; and if anyone is curious as to how it will be distributed, as to countries and types of commodities, he can find the breakdown on page 294 of the record.

I wish to say one thing about offshore procurement. I remember when some folks came to me and said, "They are going to buy this or that abroad; and it ought to be stopped." Maybe it should be. But the offshore procurement program is not nearly so big in dollars or in variety as some folks think it is.

Secondly, Mr. President, it has a very fundamental purpose; mainly the development of a sort of self-functioning munitions industry in some of the small countries which could not even manufacture the ammunition for their own guns. If we are going to establish an industry on a modest basis we have to keep it running. So we buy some ammunition. We buy this, that, and the other thing. But it is in good hands and it is getting results. So at long last there will be established industries in some countries, so that they can make provision for themselves in the way of small arms, ammunition, howitzers, mortar shells. Those are the things the people of most any country can make if they have some tools, if they have some equipment, and if they have the know-how.

Up to June 30, 1953, we had \$2¼ billion in this offshore procurement pro-

gram. There was some subsidy in it. There was what is sometimes referred to as the Lisbon subsidy. It amounted to about \$395 million. I know it was a subsidy. I do not condone it. But we got this thing on pretty good ground. So the offshore procurement program has been very substantially reduced.

For 1954 the total new money for this program was \$456 million, of which \$366 million was for expenditure in Europe. There was a carryover, I think, of \$320 million. For fiscal year 1955 it is expected to obligate only about \$300 million.

There are a few general things to which I must allude, and then I shall call up the amendments I have at the desk.

Mr. President, there is a very dry and uninteresting aspect of this matter which deserves some attention, and that is the question of unobligated and unexpended balances.

I know there are occasions when, with a rather venal glint in my eye, I said, "Look. There is so much unobligated and so much unexpended. Now we can put our hands on it and put the ax in deep."

But I wish to remind the Senate, first of all, that while there is a very substantial amount of unexpended balance, roughly about two and a quarter billion of unobligated balances, the difficulty these agencies encounter today under the procedures involved in this bill should not be overlooked. Years ago, when I was serving on the House Appropriations Committee, I felt it was much better and more expeditious simply to authorize. Then, of course, the agency had authority to commit, and in due course the appropriations could be made simply to cover the authorization. We work now on an appropriative basis, so that we run into the whole question of unexpended and unobligated balances. But let us look at the whole story for a moment. Suppose we are going to ask a country that is on the long NATO sweep, a country such as Turkey, to set into motion forces to provide a few additional armored divisions, let us say. An armored division does not, like Phoenix, spring full-blown overnight, because, after all, those countries have laws similar to some we have; and an armored division, first of all, consists of young men. So it is necessary to begin with a Draft Act or with conscription, if the country has provided for conscription, or to begin with volunteers; and then there is all the necessary administrative and preliminary work before a single raw recruit arrives at camp, let alone is in uniform or is taught close-order drill or deployed drill, or before he knows a single thing about a weapon such as a military rifle. Months and months pass before he is even in camp; and when he arrives at camp, he is still very much unprepared. Then the training begins, and during that time he must be provided with food and clothing. Finally a rifle must be placed in his hand, and there must be a rifle range and there must be ammunition. Day after day and week after week and month after month that performance must be gone through. Then if a complicated unit, such as an armored

division is involved, it will require vehicles and tanks; or if an air division is involved, think of all the work in that field that is necessary. But that is not the whole story, because when the unit is finally in readiness, so it can be placed on the line, spare parts must be available, because tanks and airplanes have a way of breaking down.

So we can set a force in motion on January 1, 1954; but it may be 2 or 2½ years before we see the fruit at the other end of the line. That is what we call the lead time. Our officials cannot go to the officials of other governments and say to them, "We wish you would do this in the interest of the NATO defense line or in the interest of defense in the Pacific. We wish you would get up a couple of divisions." They would reply, "What reason have we to believe that your Congress and your country will stand by, in case we do?"

Our officials have to have in their hands authority for it, long before the negotiations begin, because they cannot negotiate with officials of other countries unless our officials are in a position to say, "We have the authority to negotiate and to come in." Furthermore, of course such negotiations and commitments are predicated upon plans, which have to have the close scrutiny of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of our other military authorities.

So, Mr. President, when we deal with a question of unexpended and unobligated balances, certainly billions of dollars must be appropriated and made available in that way, because a plane or a tank is not built overnight. So there must be large amounts of unexpended and unobligated balances, in order that the programs may remain fluid, as they must.

After all, Mr. President, it is impossible to make a definite plan and to say that exact plan will be carried out, and that no changes will ever be made in it. That is impossible, because the situation upon which the plan is based is very likely to change. For instance, a plan may be developed in connection with an area in the Pacific; and a program may be launched, in connection with that plan. Then, suddenly, a new pressure point may develop. That will call for a change in, or a realignment of, the plan or the program. When such a change in the program is required, those in charge are not able to say, "We will send an S O S to Congress, and will ask Congress to hold a special session, so that we may be able to present our troubles." Indeed not, Mr. President. We endeavor to appropriate sufficient money and to give them sufficient funds, to enable them to carry on in flexible fashion.

In that connection, we must be sure that, by our acts, we do not disrupt the entire arrangement, because the unexpended funds and the unobligated funds are funds which those in charge of the work have programmed, and the programs are complicated, and do not come into being overnight. I would be the last to disturb them, knowing how much time, effort, patience, hard work, and real interpretation have gone into them.

Mr. President, this marks the end of the story, in modest detail.

At this point I wish to pay tribute and testimony to gentlemen like Stanley Sommer, Tom Scott, and others who are members of the staff of the Appropriations Committee. Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know what we who serve on the Appropriations Committee would do if we did not have one of the finest and most competent staffs ever to be found anywhere. They come early, and remain late. They are at their work at all hours of the day and night, working hard. They steep themselves in the abstruse appropriations language. They live with these bills, and they get the answers. They know the relationships between Congress and the executive branch. So I salute every one of them. If I saw here at this time Everard Smith, the very able chief of the Appropriations Committee staff, I would salute him, also, for the marvelous job and devoted service he has rendered this country. I used to be a Member of the House of Representatives, and used to work with the House Appropriations Committee. We used to have on the House side a chap by the name of Marcellus Sheild. If we wished to know an answer to any question regarding appropriations, it used to be common to say, "Go talk to Marc Sheild."

On the Senate side, it would be, "Go talk to Everard Smith."

Mr. President, these excellent staff members have all the answers; and when I say that, I do not use a mere figure of speech; it is the gospel truth. So I salute every one of them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I concur in everything the Senator from Illinois has said about the committee staff, although I disagree with the speech he has made. The staff of the committee is most outstanding and excellent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are a number of amendments which I am sure are noncontroversial. I wish to call them up at this time. I now send them to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, in line 18, before the colon, it is proposed to insert "which shall be consolidated with this appropriation."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this amendment is only for the purpose of making sure that no complications in bookkeeping arise, and that the appropriations and holdovers can be carried in a consolidated account.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 12, before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following: "including

(notwithstanding the provision of section 9 of the act of March 4, 1909 (31 U. S. C. 673)), expenses in connection with meetings of persons whose employment is authorized by section 530 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some question arose as to whether the experts, consultants, and other persons employed without compensation, but who would receive, perhaps, on occasion, per diem amounts and their expenses, would be covered by language justifying the payment of those amounts. In order to make absolutely clear that when they go to meetings in a consultative capacity, there will be authority to pay their expenses, this language is suggested for incorporation in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, on page 7, in line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, in line 4, before the colon, it is proposed to insert the following: "and except that this prohibition shall not apply to employees receiving salaries in excess of \$12,000 as result of general pay-raise legislation enacted during the fiscal year 1955."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are on the payroll of the Foreign Operations Administration some persons in grade 15, with salaries of \$11,800. If, for any reason, Congress this year or next year provides a pay raise, the salary of those persons would be increased to an amount in excess of \$12,000, with the result that, under the prohibition, such persons would be precluded from receiving the pay raise, whereas those in the lower brackets would receive it. Obviously that would not be fair, merely because an interdiction was carried in the language of the previous bill. Obviously those persons are entitled to share in whatever pay raise the Congress grants other Federal employees, and they are entitled to share in that pay raise no less than the Federal employees in the city of Washington. Therefore, this amendment would make it possible for employees of the Administration, whose salaries happen, because of that development, to be carried above \$12,000 to receive the benefit of that increase.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, in lines 1 through 9, it is proposed to strike out section 106.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in two different places the bill carries language requiring that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of the commodities procured within the United States out of the funds made available under this act and transported abroad on ocean vessels, be transported on United States flag vessels, to the extent that such vessels are available at market rates. Obviously

it is not necessary to have that provision made at two places in the bill. This amendment is simply for the purpose of striking out the provision in one of the two places, because to have the language appear twice would be redundant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, in line 2, it is proposed to insert:

Such funds shall be considered obligated in accordance with the provisions of section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1955 on written orders issued by the Secretary of Defense to the military departments for the procurement or delivery of supplies and services, when receipt of such orders has been acknowledged in writing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a real auditing and bookkeeping problem always arises when these agencies deal with one another—as, for instance, in connection with dealings between FOA and the Department of Defense, or between FOA and the Navy Department. Question arises as to how to make the accounting if, for instance, certain articles are marked for delivery to another service; and the question is whether the funds are considered obligated when the goods reach the point of delivery, or whether that determination is to be made on the basis of the country or the geographical area.

This, then, is language which has been suggested to simplify and also expedite their accounting and bookkeeping. As I recall, this has the support of the Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and others.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee was particularly interested in this and wanted to offer the amendment himself. I understand he is attending a meeting of the policy committee, and for the moment cannot be on hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the foreign-aid program, I request unanimous consent to have included in the body of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared relating to section 103 (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (H. R. 9678).

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

Section 103 (c) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (H. R. 9678) authorizes the use of military-assistance funds for the offshore procurement of equipment or materials. Fortunately, certain safeguards which are intended for the protection of American industry have been included.

For the purpose of emphasis and reference, section 103 (c) is quoted below:

"Funds made available pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may be used for the procurement of equipment or materials outside the United States unless the President determines that such procurement will

result in one or more of the following conditions:

"(1) Adverse effects upon the economy of the United States, with special reference to any areas of labor surplus, or upon the industrial mobilization base, which outweigh the strategic and logistic advantages to the United States of procurement abroad;

"(2) Production of such equipment or materials outside the United States under inadequate safeguards against sabotage or the release to potential enemies of information detrimental to the security of the United States;

"(3) Unjustifiable cost in comparison with procurement in the United States, taking into account transportation costs for delivery overseas; and

"(4) Delays in delivery incompatible with United States defense objectives."

My interest in these provisions stems from my activities as chairman of the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The depressed conditions in American shipyards, to which the subcommittee gave much attention, cannot be permitted to prevail even for a limited period of time. Unquestionably, the offshore procurement of ships has contributed to the present plight of our shipyards. While some improvement will naturally accrue from maritime legislation now in various stages of passage in the Congress, the predicament of this vital industry is not a capricious notion. The relationship of the American shipbuilding industry to our national economy and to our national defense potential cannot be challenged.

Convinced that these depressed conditions in American shipyards merited for them preferential consideration over foreign shipyards for which contracts had been allotted under the Navy's off-shore ship procurement program, I felt it incumbent upon me as chairman of the Senate Water Transportation Subcommittee to urge that these contracts be placed in this country. As a result, several months ago, I was advised by Admiral Leggett, Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Ships, for whom I have the highest regard, that contracts totaling \$27,500,000 for minesweepers for the North Atlantic Treaty countries, would be diverted back from European shipyards to yards in this country.

For fiscal year 1955, it is my understanding that the offshore-procurement program has been reduced in comparison to previous years, but it still contemplates an expenditure in foreign areas of \$28 million for ships.

The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations dealing with the mutual security appropriation bill (1955) contains a very encouraging observation which I feel is worthy of repetition:

"The committee was impressed with evidence presented from several sources protesting against procurement of certain types of civilian supplies and equipment through the offshore program. While the committee feels that the objectives sought by the administration in attempting to shore up the economy of our allies is commendable, there is strong feeling that this should not be done at the expense of those United States industries which are experiencing economic difficulties. Accordingly, the committee directs that the administration evaluate carefully all contracts made under the offshore-procurement program and admonishes the administration to weigh carefully such factors in the letting of all contracts. It is further directed that quarterly reports be submitted to the committee listing, on an item-by-item basis including unit costs, all items procured through the offshore-procurement program."

The comments of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives are likewise deserving of consideration:

"The total programed to date for offshore procurement is approximately \$2.2 billion. The amount planned for this activity in 1955 is \$300 million. The purposes of this program are well understood by the committee and the program should be continued in the interest of mutual defense, both from the standpoint of pricing and development of defense capabilities of our allies. However, it is the feeling of the committee that in the past some phases of this program were embarked upon without full consideration having been given to the maintenance of a desired mobilization base in this country. It will be advantageous to continue to procure many items outside the United States, particularly certain ammunition. However, the program, both current and proposed, should be closely reviewed with the view of a more strict application of conditions governing such procurement, as stated in section 103 (c) of the authorizing legislation."

Thus, the congressional intent would seem to be clear and precise. Distortions to our domestic economy are not the intended by-product of offshore-procurement programs, and I would certainly characterize the present posture of the American shipbuilding industry as distorted.

Having devoted much attention to the entire offshore-procurement program, and being firmly convinced that our shipbuilding capacity and potential must be preserved and strengthened, I shall continue to view with much disdain any offshore procurement of ships.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment on page 5, line 16. To that amendment, I admit that a point of order should be sustained, but I have another amendment to offer, and I send it forward to the desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment which has been sent to the desk by the Senator from Nevada in effect makes a change in an amendment which has been agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment has been agreed to, and it has not been stricken out on a point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move to strike the committee amendment, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair understands correctly, the Senator from Nevada moves to strike out the language of the committee amendment and insert the language contained in the amendment sent to the desk.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 16, it is proposed to strike out the proviso and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That no funds appropriated in this act shall be used to assist directly in the migration to any nation in the Western Hemisphere of any person not having a security clearance based on standards comparable to those standards contained in the United States Immigration and Nationality Act."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, since the first amendment was subject to a

point of order, I have sent to the desk another amendment on the same subject, which has been read by the clerk. This amendment is a limitation on an appropriation bill, and I have been so informed by the Parliamentarian.

Mr. President, this amendment would provide that none of our contributions to the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration shall be used to assist any person to migrate to the Western Hemisphere who does not have a security clearance based on standards comparable to those in the United States Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. President, this amendment follows the principle of the great Monroe Doctrine. Under it there could not come into the Western Hemisphere those who would not comply with our standards of internal security.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I certainly will.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It was my intention to raise a point of order with regard to the proviso which the Senator has just proposed be stricken, and for which he has offered a new amendment. After talking with the distinguished Senator from Nevada, I am convinced that he is endeavoring to accomplish something in which we are all deeply interested and desire to support.

In order to clarify the matter in my own mind and in the minds of those who may read the RECORD, I should like to ask the Senator 2 or 3 questions which I think will clarify any possible issue which might arise.

In the first place, is there a conflict here? This may possibly be offensive to the Latin American countries, if we seem to be indicating what should be their standards for admission of outsiders. I should say that I am opposed to the United States unilaterally trying to impose on international organizations or sovereign nations its own attitudes and laws. We should reach these objectives collectively and cooperatively.

Is it the purpose of this amendment to require that the ICEM or any receiving country adopt the screening requirements of the United States, or are we simply aiming to provide security clearance for individuals who may be going to these countries?

Mr. McCARRAN. The latter part of the Senator's statement expresses the intentment of the amendment; in other words, it is to secure clearance for individuals who may come to countries in this hemisphere, and to guide our own officials in effecting, so far as possible, the standards prescribed by the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. A further question which occurs to me in this connection is this: I assume from the use of the words "assist directly" the Senator from Nevada does not intend to make the ICEM keep separate accounts of administrative funds, but he intends only that the United States funds shall not be used to move a migrant to the Western Hemisphere after it has been discovered that he would not meet United States standards. Am I correct in that?

Mr. McCARRAN. The question is to be answered in the affirmative.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We can go ahead and make our appropriation to the ICEM in Geneva so it may be used for administrative purposes, regardless of whether it is kept in separate accounts. If Mr. "X" has been selected to go to Brazil, let us say, we are merely interested in seeing that Mr. "X" meets the security requirements of our rules.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. A further question. It is my understanding that the appropriation for this item in this bill is for the United States contribution for calendar year 1955, thus giving ICEM until January 1955 to adjust to this provision. It is clear to me that if we were to put this into effect immediately, there would possibly be some machinery needed in Geneva whereby the security clearances could be provided for. ICEM has adequate appropriations already to take care of their program until next January, and the Senator's amendment would give the organization until that time to arrange for these clearances. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the intention of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Naturally, we assume the organization will act along these lines more quickly, if possible, but I am glad to have the Senator's reassurance that that is the intention.

Finally, I ask this question: I notice the word "identical" appears in the original draft, and that it has been changed to "comparable." I would interpret the word "comparable" as applied to security standards to go to the substance of the protections afforded by the Immigration and Nationality Act, and not necessarily to the details, technicalities, and so on. What we are endeavoring to do is protect ourselves against subversives infiltrating into South America.

Mr. McCARRAN. We are trying to protect the United States of America from those who might be brought into countries in the Western Hemisphere, who are inimical to our internal security or our external security. We also intend to protect the entire Western Hemisphere from infiltration by Communists from abroad.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am very glad indeed with this explanation, to ally myself with the Senator in this amendment. As he has said, we recognize today that the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 was announced, in consideration of something at the time which was totally different from the danger we face today. We have seen evidence in the Guatemala situation, for example, of penetration which is definitely in violation of the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The distinguished Senator is trying to put into words a guiding sign that the infiltration by Communist subversives is one of the dangers which we guard against today in our interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has expressed my views exactly.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Michigan has a short statement to make. I intend to suggest the absence of a quorum before I speak on my amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 14, before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph may be used for assistance to any nation which in the opinion of the President is not cooperating in common defense efforts against further Communist penetration and aggression."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amount involved in this particular section of the bill, on which the amendment would be a limitation, is \$700 million. It was the purpose in the appropriation bill, as well as in the authorization, to allow the President of the United States this sum of money and to allow him flexibility, so that he could use it to the best advantage possible to the United States.

However, we feel that Congress should speak out and say what it thinks should be the guide line. The Senator from Nevada and the Senator from New Jersey have said that one of the forms of aggression is Communist penetration or infiltration. I think the time has come when we must prepare not only for an aggressive war, but when those of us who are opposed to communism and feel it is an evil must see to it that Communist penetration is stopped, whether it be inside a country or across a border.

Therefore, we feel that this amendment would set up a guide line and give the President discretion because he is familiar with the facts.

It is not a limitation upon him in the sense that he cannot do as he believes the facts warrant. The amendment provides:

Provided, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph may be used for assistance to any nation which in the opinion of the President is not cooperating in common defense efforts against further Communist penetration and aggression.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the Senator from Michigan that the amendment is a sound and necessary amendment. The original amount involved was for the defense of Indochina. No one knows exactly what the future may hold in that area of the world. Certainly as a result of the Communist advances into the Tokin Delta and as a result of their taking over an area in northern Vietnam, populated by about 10 million people, there is created a very great threat to Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, southern Vietnam, the Malay States, the Philippines, and Indonesia, and perhaps even Australia and New Zealand.

In this section of the bill, dealing with the fund which is designed for defense in that area of the world, it seems to me that the very least that should be expected of any of the nations which would participate in the use of these funds is that such nations should be willing to cooperate in common defense efforts against further Communist penetration or aggression.

This is, as I have always understood, a mutual security undertaking.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the common defense, for mutual defense against the one great danger in the world—in Europe as well as in Asia and in the Americas—the international Communist conspiracy. It is the conspiracy which has its fountainhead in the Kremlin and which has been moving into every vacuum that has been created in the world.

It was for that purpose that the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance was set up. It was for that purpose that economic aid was given. Its purpose was to insure that free nations might not be weakened and fall prey to ruthless communism.

In this area of the world communism has been on the march. It was temporarily stopped in a stalemate war in Korea. Having been stopped there, communism has been feeling out every other section of the world. For the moment that part of the world happens to be southern Asia. There communism has won a substantial victory, and has endangered other areas in southeastern Asia.

If we believe in collective security, if we believe in a mutual-defense system, and if this is a mutual-security bill, then it seems to me that the nations which are participating in such collective and mutual security should at least be prepared to cooperate in a common effort to prevent further Communist aggression and penetration. If they are not prepared to do it, it seems to me the American people and the American Government and Congress, and the other free peoples of the world, should be so informed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator from California has spoken in behalf of the amendment. I agree with what he has said.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the amendment of the Senator from Michigan should be adopted, the Senator does not believe, does he, that the terms of the truce in Indochina, which places a limitation upon the freedom of the Vietnamese kingdom to associate itself with us in a defense activity, would prevent the United States from assisting the Vietnamese militarily?

Mr. FERGUSON. The President would, in his discretion, be able to assist them in their desire to defend themselves because under the terms of the truce they would be able to defend themselves.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I completely concur in that statement, because certainly, whether the terms of the Geneva conference and some of the protocols of the

conference may prevent the wholehearted participation which the Vietnamese and Cambodians and Laotians may wish to have in joining a pact, and although there may be some prohibition against doing it under the terms of the Geneva conference, certainly there would be no prohibition against their common effort to prevent further Communist penetration and aggression from taking place, and that would be of benefit to the nations of the free world.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Michigan. Is it the Senator's hope that most of the equipment which the United States has given to the French Union forces which are now in south Vietnam and the equipment which is being evacuated from the north will be given to the local Vietnamese forces, to permit them to defend themselves?

Mr. FERGUSON. They and the other free nations in that area of the world certainly should share those weapons in defending themselves.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is the hope of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If I correctly understand the breakdown of the figures in this appropriation, the fund to which the Senator from Michigan is referring is \$700 million.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It does not apply to the other funds for the Far East?

Mr. FERGUSON. It applies to this particular fund.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. For Burma, Indonesia, and the other countries?

Mr. FERGUSON. It applies to this very fund, \$700 million.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its labors this evening it stand in recess until 10 o'clock next Monday morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10051) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment, 8-10-54-E.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,392,700,000" and insert "\$1,192,700,000."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate, which has done so much work in the past 2 months, but I believe this amendment is worth bringing to the attention of the Senate, because, certainly, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, when the bill was shown to me, I was deceived, so to speak.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I shall speak for only 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Now, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I know that no member of the Appropriations Committee will differ with me in the statement that there was an amendment in the appropriation bill—and I read from page 3 of the side-slip—as follows:

The executive branch recommends that the following revision be incorporated in the pending bill on page 2, line 20: "Provided further, That the military supplies and equipment (or the equivalent value thereof as the Secretary of Defense shall determine) which have been procured and processed for delivery to foreign areas and which subsequently are returned to the custody of the United States because of a change in the international situation shall remain available for military assistance authorized by law, and such amounts shall be in addition to the amounts herein otherwise provided for."

I wish to be frank, Mr. President. I have apparently been tricked, but when I saw this item in the Appropriations Committee I brought it up, and the honorable and distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. SALTONSTALL] told me that we should at least know what we are doing in the Appropriations Committee. We adopted an amendment to limit the authorization to \$200 million.

That is all that my amendment would do. It would not eliminate any foreign aid. It only asks that the Defense Department use \$200 million worth of goods which was on its way to Indochina and is still aboard ship. Either it has not been delivered or it is still on the docks. The amendment would require only the use of that material before taking \$200 million out of the cashbook of the American taxpayers. That is all it would do. I am not proposing to cut out any foreign aid.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want the Senator from South Carolina to orient me on the

purpose of his amendment. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that his amendment would take away \$200 million?

Mr. MAYBANK. In cash.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In cash money?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is right.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And that would be supplanted by war material and equipment which we now have on hand, which has already been paid for?

Mr. MAYBANK. By shipments of material which the distinguished Joint Chiefs of Staff stopped from going to Indochina. I shall not go into the details. The Senator from New Mexico was at the meeting with General Stewart. Millions of dollars worth of material was on its way, which never was delivered. We can use that instead of using new tax money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand, it is as simple as taking away \$200 million of new money?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But it is not intended to deprive this country of the materials which it has bought.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; those materials would be available.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They would be made available through material already in existence, for which the American taxpayers have already paid.

Mr. MAYBANK. One of our great military leaders has testified that the material is in existence. But I shall not go into that. The Senator from New Mexico was at the meeting.

All I ask is that we use what we have; that the taxpayers be paid back, rather than that we should spend \$200 million more. That is all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will be quite clear about what is intended by the amendment. It is offered on page 2 of the bill and relates to military assistance. It is clearly an effort to reduce the amount of military assistance provided in the bill, all up and down the line, by \$200 million.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is aware that no one knows, according to page 3 of the side slips, how much military equipment we have. The Senator knows that it was presumed to be around \$700 million, but no one could tell us how much was available. There was some testimony that \$60 million worth of equipment was already in ships which have not been unloaded. The Senator knows that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator knows more than that.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know more than that, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the bill was first presented, the request for new funds for military assistance was \$1,580,000,000. The language of the bill as reported by the committee—I think by a unanimous vote, with one or two reservations—provides for \$1,392,000,000.

The item for military assistance was reduced very substantially. But the Senator from South Carolina wants to cut it by \$200 million more.

This item does not apply alone to Europe; it applies to the whole military assistance amount. It is for any military items that may be in the bill, whether they be for Africa, southeast Asia, or Europe.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Please let me continue for a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am always glad to listen to the eloquent voice of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I tried to make clear this afternoon how completely fretful and feverish the entire military picture is. There are troops in large numbers stationed in China, immediately across from Formosa. They are no idle threat. I could see them through field glasses. They were shelling the island with howitzers the day before I arrived. There had been an actual invasion some months before that time. There is serious business over there. So we had better be careful about cutting military items.

There was written into the authorization bill a degree of flexibility which was designed to give the Commander in Chief, to whom the appropriations are made—they are made to the President in every case—an opportunity to assess the situation as he goes along, relying upon the intelligence he receives from his Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill provides for \$500 million more than the authorization bill which the Senate passed. Anyone with commonsense knows that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The language speaks for itself. The amount is \$445 million below the estimate.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, but—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator let me continue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to ask that the regular order be followed. Unless the Senator from Illinois, who has the floor, intends to yield and does yield, he will continue with his remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend from South Carolina has confidence in the men who have been doing the real spade work in the Appropriations Committee. We have fine staff members, who are very competent indeed. They verify and re-verify, time and again, each item as it comes before them. One needs only to read the report.

The bill as reported to the Senate, for fiscal 1955, is \$447 million less than the estimates, and is \$1,540,000,000 less than the amount appropriated for the previous year, fiscal 1954. Either I can read figures, or I cannot. That is what the report shows. The committee staff would not dare present to the Senate figures which were at variance, because the Senate will have to go to conference with these figures.

The figures which are contained in the bill will have to meet the test of the Budget Bureau; but, more than that, they will have to meet the test of the General Accounting Office, when the accounts are set up.

There are the figures: A billion and a half dollars less than was appropriated for 1954; a mere half billion dollars under the estimates for 1955.

The question came up on the theory that there would be much recoverable equipment in Indochina; therefore, we should make a slash. I have gone into that. There was a great deal of testimony about it, most of it off the record. I had to ascertain as best I could what the real facts were.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish my good friend from South Carolina would let me answer him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is authentic information which I received from the department:

The dollar value of equipment in Indochina that can be recovered and used elsewhere in the program cannot be determined at the present time, since we are now in the process of making arrangements with the French Government and three Associated States as to the disposal of the military equipment on hand. It is anticipated, however, that most of this equipment will be required by forces of southern Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, and by those forces of the French Union which continue to be stationed in the area.

We shall try to develop the program where the equipment is located. There are small neighboring countries which need some of it. Some of the equipment may have to go elsewhere, but we cannot do any more than conjecture what amount will be recovered and what will be available for distribution elsewhere.

Are we, in the quiet of this Chamber on a Saturday afternoon, about to tie the hands of the Commander in Chief of an operation which is 12,000 miles from the Nation's Capital? That would be most shortsighted, and I would not want to be in that situation.

I have confidence in Admiral Radford, in General Van Fleet, and in General Eisenhower. If we cannot take their word, whose word can we take? I would rather err on the larger side and see extra money provided than to reduce the amount still further at the time when it might be needed, particularly in the case of military items. I assure the Senate that the cut which is proposed on page 2 is in the military-assistance program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. My friend from Illinois has spoken about Admiral Radford. I wish the administration had had enough sense to listen to Admiral Radford last February.

No one holds Admiral Carney, who is one of the great men the Nation has produced, in higher regard than I do.

No one holds General Ridgway, who is a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in higher esteem than I do. I am certain that he is disappointed that two divisions were eliminated.

No one holds General Twining in higher regard than I do.

But the Senator from Illinois well knows that none of the members of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff knows how much they have. That is the truth. We heard the secret testimony. They have equipment, equipment, and equipment. I understand there is equipment to the value of \$62 million now in ships, and quite a number of the ships are in port.

Why tax the American people again, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] so well stated—he was present at the secret sessions—in order to provide more money for more equipment, when we already have sufficient equipment which is unused?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am so glad my friend brought up Admiral Radford.

Mr. MAYBANK. He is a great man—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, let me proceed for just a moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator was in the secret meetings when we talked with him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not allowed to disclose what he said.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I share the admiration of the Senator from South Carolina for Admiral Radford. He is one of the great military men—quiet, restrained, and well demeaned.

What did he say? He said there in the hearing room, "Gentlemen, I entreat you earnestly not to cut these items or to destroy the flexibility in the bill."

Since the Senator from South Carolina and I both share an almost religious devotion to Admiral Radford, let us join with him, and either withdraw the amendment or reject it by a resounding vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Illinois knows well enough that what I am referring to is what Admiral Radford said in confidence.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. And I will not repeat it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What I stated was what he said in an open hearing.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is not what I was referring to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from South Carolina is proposing to cut out \$200 million for military purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not proposing to cut out anything. I am merely proposing to take over the material which was to be shipped to Indochina, which is worth \$92 million, according to the ticker tape, so it must be correct; and I am proposing that that material be used, instead of putting out more of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is serious business. We are fooling with the destiny of this country. The amendment of the Senator from South Carolina proposes on page 2, line 6, to strike out, \$1,392,700,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,192,700,000." That is a \$200 million cut in the military item in the bill. On the basis of the testimony of Gruenther, Radford, and Van Fleet, I would be the last man in this Senate to go along with that kind of proposal, when these feverish forces are on the horizon in the Pacific area. That is the amendment of the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, that is the amendment—

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the amendment is based on the proposal that the Secretary of Defense shall turn over to FOA not to exceed \$200 million. I see that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is on his feet. He himself limited the amount to \$200 million. He and I together did it in the committee. That does not count the ships. That does not count everything we have given them at the expense of the American people. That amendment is based only on the assumption that the Senator from Massachusetts and myself—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Illinois yielded the floor?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Not yet.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thought he had.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I desire to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know the Senator from Illinois would not wish to shut me off.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, indeed not.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to complete my statement, Mr. President. I appreciate that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois has yielded to me. I say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], for whom I have great affection, that he limited the amount to \$200 million in the committee. I do not know how much is involved, but all I am asking is a limitation of \$200 million, so that available material can be used in lieu of cash. Let me say further, because the Senator from Massachusetts comes from a seaport town, as I do, that ships were not affected. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I merely wish to add that there is material in various ships, on various docks, and in various places, but the material must be inventoried, assembled, and then directed to the places where it can best be used. What the Senator from South Carolina is proposing is that we say to our forces and to our friends in Europe, "There may be 100,000 rifles or a few tanks on a ship somewhere in the middle of the Pacific. You take that instead of the cash you may need for the equipment that will be useful in Europe at the present time."

The value of the material is in excess of \$200 million. There is no question about that. But, when \$200 million in cash is taken out of the bill, and in its place we say that there is available \$200 million of guns and tanks which may be in some ship, or in a certain state of repair, or on some land in Indochina, that is not providing the aid that is intended to be provided by the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to express my great admiration for the distinguished

chairman of the Armed Services Committee. We both voted for the nominations of Twining, Radford, and Carney, and those officers have enough sense to know that if the cargo in those ships is needed, it will be sent quickly to the proper place.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The expert who testified before the committee—I do not recall his name at the moment—said that the material had to be inventoried, examined, and redirected. There is material which may be available. However, that is not what we are trying to do. We are trying to give Europe what she needs most at the present time. We are trying to direct the most efficient aid possible to Indochina and other countries in the Far East. If that material is to be of assistance, let us make it available; but let us not say that we will make available the material in place of cash.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to understand what the chairman of the Armed Services Committee has said. He has stated that there is material available somewhere, but it is not inventoried. We do not know how much it may be worth. It may be worth \$1,500,000,000 or \$1 billion. But, instead of making that material available, it is being proposed that \$200 million of the taxpayers' money shall be given away, and that the donees, foreign countries, may spend it wherever they please and not buy materials manufactured in this country.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. We are providing that \$200 million will be used for material which will be manufactured in this country and shipped to the people to whom it will be most useful, provided Admiral Radford and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff say it is the right material for the right spot at the right time. If some of the material that is in the swamps of Indochina can be made available and it is found to be useful, of course, that can be arranged. However, those arrangements must be worked out.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I beg the pardon of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I merely wish to say, while we are talking about Indochina, that General Van Fleet came to the committee for a secret meeting. I shall not talk about what he said with reference to Indochina. I only hope and pray—and I say that most respectfully—that we recapture that material. I am talking about material that has never been delivered. I am talking about what is in the holds of ships. I am talking about what is on the docks. Of course, there is material worth \$1 billion in Indochina. I am not going into that.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. If we knew exactly where the material was, and we could inventory it, assemble it, and ship it to where we wanted it to go, then I would support the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. However, that is not the case, and the facts will not be known for several months. We are not certain where that material is at this time, and for that reason I do not think we should deny these funds. Therefore, I must vote against the amendment.

In the course of time I hope the material will be inventoried, assembled, and shipped to the places where it is needed. In that event the cash will be in reserve next year. That is the assurance we have received. We have received the assurance that if the material can be inventoried, assembled, and shipped to the places where it is needed, the money will not be spent. However, if the material is not found and inventoried in the amounts and in the manner we anticipate or hope it will be, then there will be a need for the money. I shall not be a party to jeopardizing our national security while we are hunting for an inventory of material.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. What relationship is there between the \$200 million and the proviso which appears at the bottom of page 2, and running over to page 3, which refers to \$200 million in inventory value?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That language was suggested, and it was modified by the Appropriations Committee so that we could make an exception up to \$200 million, so far as cash inventory was concerned, but excluding capital ships. I have not looked at it recently.

Mr. CASE. Does that overlap on this \$200 million?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly. That is additional money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The cut, of course, applies to all the military items here; and when we lump all these together—and I want my friend, the Senator from South Carolina to listen—

Mr. MAYBANK. I always listen to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are a number of imponderables here we do not know.

Mr. MAYBANK. I might say—

Mr. DIRKSEN. We do not know how much is in ships at the moment. We do not know how many supplies will be recovered. We do not know at the moment, under the rather vague terms of the so-called Geneva Peace Treaty, how much we can redeploy out of storage in Vietnam; and also Laos, next door; and Cambodia, next door; nor do we know what the needs may be in Burma or in Thailand. We have to allow some latitude to those in authority.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I want him to yield because he mentioned my name.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know how else we could do it. We might save a million dollars or we might save a couple of million dollars. I assume if the material is not needed in the Far East and

if the situation is such that the challenge can be met without the extra money, obviously it will come back and it will show up as an unexpended balance.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has yielded to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator mentioned me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can only hear with one ear at a time.

Mr. CASE. Let me say—

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Illinois often listens to the left.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will yield to my friend from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Illinois suspend, please, until we have order. It is possible to yield to only one Senator. The official reporter, who is trying to follow this debate, can follow the voice of only one person. So if Senators follow the regular order, the Chair is sure all Senators will get along much better.

To whom does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Presiding Officer. I only wish to say that I have seen the Senate Official Reporters take down, with accuracy, as many as 4 or 5 voices at one time.

In answer to the Senator from Illinois, of course nobody knows what may happen. The Senator from Illinois knows as well as I do that we have sent a billion dollars worth of equipment to the area to which we are referring. That was in the newspapers. How much we will get back is not known.

However, I am not talking about that. I am talking about \$200 million worth of material which has never been sent. It is aboard ship or is tied up at the docks.

I hope and pray that under the able leadership of our Chief of Staff we shall get all back.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I surrender the floor, and ask for a vote.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in considering this amendment I believe it would be well to point out that this is a part of the European program which has been going on for some time. Since we undertook this program we have given Europe \$17 billion in arms and defense support—which has been, in many cases, a process of letting them manufacture the arms for themselves, rather than giving our men the work and the business in American factories.

That amount is on hand, Mr. President. That is not \$17 billion which had to be consumed in a war. Thank the merciful Lord the Communists have not captured that \$17 billion worth of supplies and equipment. It is all waiting there—the \$17 billion.

In addition to that, we have on hand for Europe approximately \$5.8 billion more. That is on its way. That is enough to carry the European program for some time—\$5.8 billion.

What the Senator from South Carolina is proposing to say is, "Give Europe

everything we ever talked about giving Europe, but we have a windfall of about \$1.4 billion in Indochina."

Why do I call it a windfall? Because the French lost the war. We had \$1.4 billion worth of material we were going to send there. Much of it has not been delivered. It is still on the way.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator permit me to take a moment or two more? Someone did say, "Why do we not give the money to Thailand?" We already have an adequate program for Thailand.

In this overall program there will be \$13 billion on hand when this bill passes. Out of the \$13 billion we have on hand, how much could we effectively spend in Thailand? We came up with a figure, if I recall correctly, of around \$22.7 million.

Someone said, "Give it to Burma." We cannot give it to Burma. Burma will not take it.

Someone said, "Give it to India." We cannot give it to India. India will not take it. India will not agree with us on any sort of a mutual defense arrangement.

Someone said "Give it to Indonesia." Indonesia turned it down. Indonesia will not take it. That is why we will not be able to give it to Indonesia, just as we cannot give it to Ibn Saud in Saudi Arabia. The newspapers today carried the story that we had sent a 30-man delegation to Saudi Arabia with \$1.7 million, and he threw them out on their ears. He would rather have the \$200 million from the American oil companies than that little \$1.7 million with strings attached to it in the point 4 program.

We have this thing loaded down with more money than we can spend in 2½ years.

We had another \$1.4 billion involved in the war, in Indochina. France lost that war.

What does the Senator from South Carolina say? The Senator says, "Take some of that \$1.4 billion we saved over there"—it is not that we saved it, but we shall not be able to spend it, because the Communists won that war—"take \$200 million of that and deliver it instead of appropriating more money."

Mr. President, the Senate expressed its judgment a short time ago, and authorized an appropriation of \$2,710,000,000. Doing so, the Senate made it possible for the Committee on Foreign Relations to agree to almost exactly the committee bill. The Committee on Foreign Relations simply met with the committee on the other side and said, "We will take the figure of the difference between the Senate and the House figures and divide it by two. Then we will finally arrive at the same figure the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations agreed to in the first place." So much of the \$500 million of saving was wiped out. While our committee was in the process of conferring, the Senate Appropriations Committee was at least theoretically bound by the judgment of the Senate, because the conference had not yet reported back. At a time when they were bound by the judgment of the Sen-

ate, knowing what the judgment of the Senate was, the committee reported this bill to give \$2,990,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Plus more for the Defense Department.

Mr. LONG. Plus \$200 million extra for the Defense Department.

Mr. President, that brings us a bill which is \$400 million more than in the judgment of the Senate on the authorization bill only a week ago should be appropriated. The Senator from South Carolina is not proposing to cut back anything on the program. He wants them to have just as much as they ever have had, but he would like to see a little bit of wisdom exercised, with a little bit of careful spending on this program.

Mr. President, if we pass this bill as it stands I say this will be the most loose spending Congress there has been since World War II.

Why do I make that statement? Because here is a bill that has \$1.7 billion in it related to the Indochina war. The war ended while the bill was before the Senate. In fact, the war ended while the bill was before the House of Representatives.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. What did we do with the \$1.4 billion? We said we might have some need for it somewhere else at some time, notwithstanding the fact that we have already allowed them to build up, on hand, \$13 billion worth. Think of that—\$13 billion on hand.

Notwithstanding all of that they say, "Well, it would be well not to cut back on this item. Someone may need it sometime. It might be regarded as a fire bell, warning that we are backing off on foreign aid." So they say "Go ahead and appropriate the whole amount, even though the war is ended in Indochina."

Then, Mr. President, we discovered a short time ago that we thought we were passing a carefully scrutinized defense bill, but the very able chairman of the Armed Services Committee analyzed that budget and found out that there was \$2 billion for the Army which was "fat." The Army said the only reason they did not reduce their request by \$2 billion was that they thought it should be included for psychological purposes; that not to appropriate it might somehow affect someone and be regarded in a poor light, from a psychological standpoint.

So, Mr. President, if we take the Army figure and add this \$1.4 billion which we do not presently need to the \$2 billion excess in the Army budget we have a total of around \$3.4 billion of unjustified appropriations that this Congress is nevertheless proceeding to appropriate.

There may have been some time when we appropriated money more loosely, but I should like to find out when it was, if it ever occurred.

I submit that the Senator from South Carolina has presented a very carefully considered amendment. It reflects the judgment of the Senate a week ago, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, if he is aware that there is some \$600 million or \$700 million in this bill

to pay the cost of the Indochina war, on a 50-50 basis with France.

Mr. LONG. I am aware of that.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, the American people are paying half of the cost of the war in Indochina. That is in this bill, in addition to what I have talked about.

I cannot understand how the Secretary of Defense could suggest an amendment designed to give him the right to transfer a billion dollars to Indochina, and to transfer all of the material on the ships that have not been even unloaded.

I hope no one is suggesting that the men like Admiral Carney and General Ridgway and General Twining do not have enough sense to know what to do with those materials. If I believed that I would resign from the Senate. I have great trust in them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let us see what the figures are. In the first place, when the conference report was completed and came back, the authorizations in the conference report totaled \$3,252,000,000. That is, in round figures, \$3¼ billion. That is the conference figure.

It was said that \$228 million would not be requested, so the amount was reduced to \$3,024,000,000, which was available. The amount of the bill before us is \$2,990,000,000.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue for a moment.

We are \$34 million below the conference authority, in addition to the \$228 million of conference authority which was never requested.

Secondly, let us say with respect to Indochina, that this is not the story that the Senate has heard. There was \$800 million in the bill. How was the matter handled? We had an Executive arrangement with the Associated States and with France under which we absorbed a portion of the cost in Indochina. We sent Gen. "Iron Mike" O'Daniel out to Indochina. We sent out screening teams of auditors, and as these things went into combat we assumed our proportion, and it was taken out of the \$800 million fund.

There will be a good many charges against that fund, Mr. President, before this thing is all over, because so many of these items have not yet been audited and screened. I have no idea what the charges will be. Not even the brightest man in the military knows what they will be. It will probably be some months before they come up with the answer.

That is the whole story with respect to the conference limitation, the amount which is carried in the bill, the fund in Indochina, and how it may still have to be deployed, plus the fact that material which has been shipped may yet be used in Indochina. We are going to try to train many native troops there, and we shall need equipment.

Do not forget that there is a truce line at the narrow waist of Indochina, and below that are the old Vietnamese Province, Cochinchina, and the capital city of Saigon. All of those are in South Vietnam. We are hoping we can establish ourselves there, that there will be

equipment which can be used, and that we can put equipment in Laos and Cambodia or wherever the pressure points develop.

So this seems to be a very arbitrary cut, particularly when we consider the fact that, after all, this is a deficiency bill. The estimates were much larger than what we finally acted on in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust the amendment will be rejected.

I yield.

Mr. LONG. I refer the Senator to page 6, line 22, where this language is found:

The unexpended balances appropriated under each paragraph of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1954—

I shall eliminate the parentheses—shall be consolidated with the appropriate appropriation made under this act, and shall be available for the same general purpose and for the same period of time as the appropriate appropriation made under this act.

Is that not an appropriation of \$9,500,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. The money has been appropriated before, and that is nothing more than a consolidation for bookkeeping purposes. There is a bewildering number of accounts. If they were not consolidated, there would be various sets of books running in different directions, and we would have to pile up a huge payroll in order to look after all those accounts.

Mr. LONG. Is it not necessary to reappropriate this \$9,500,000,000 that is left on hand from previous appropriation years?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We add all the unobligated balances available, which amount to approximately \$2¼ billion, and also the unexpended balances. The important thing about it is the lead time. I discussed that at length this afternoon, and was so concerned that I desired General Stewart, Admiral Radford, Governor Stassen, the Secretary of State, and others who came before the committee to make that abundantly clear. I think the confusion arises from the fact that in other years we always did this on an authorization basis. In this program it was done upon an appropriating basis. It is the only way they can work now if they are going to carry on successful negotiations with so many countries in so many parts of the world, in order to bring them within the security orbit.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to say one word about the lead-time argument, because I have heard it used here before.

Senators will recall that in the debate on the Air Force budget, the argument was made for economies in the Air Force budget that Secretary of Defense Wilson had been able to reduce the lead time for the complicated weapons of air warfare—the jet aircraft, those on the drawing board today as well as those to be produced later, and also for complicated electronics instruments. The point was made that the Secretary of

Defense had found that, rather than requiring as much as 7 years of lead time, no more than 4 years of lead time was required for the most complicated jet aircraft.

We are delivering very few jet aircraft, and those we are delivering are not of the latest design and require only a short lead time. Most of the articles we are delivering under this program are the least-expensive type, the type used in World War II. Many of those we already have on hand in large surpluses in this country.

That type of weapon does not require long lead time, and in view of the fact that there is already on hand enough money to carry the program for 3 years, if all the lead time needed for the latest jet aircraft is 3 years, certainly when a rifle has been produced for 10 years, with the dies all set up and ready to go, 2 years' lead time is far more than is really needed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Montana withhold the request for a quorum so the Senator from South Dakota may be recognized?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask a few direct questions, and I should like direct answers.

From an examination of page 19 of the committee report, it is evident that the Senate committee proposes to appropriate \$317 million more than the House figure. Fifty-one million dollars of that is apparently new cash, and \$266 million is in the form of unobligated balances.

Does that \$317 million of additional amounts for military assistance include the \$200 million which is to be recovered or which it is hoped may be recovered from inventory values?

Mr. BRIDGES. The answer is "No."

Mr. CASE. In other words, the Senate bill actually proposes approximately \$517 million more if the inventory values are recovered?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, nobody knows now whether 5 cents worth or \$500 million worth will be recovered. The amendment to which the Senator refers is a contingent amendment which operates on the basis of a recovery. If \$100 million worth is recovered, that can be added by the FOA for general relief use wherever they may desire to apply it, or if they recover \$300 million worth they can use \$100 million additional for the Armed Services—the Navy, the Army, the Air Force—which can be used for the general defense of the country. If it were to be used by FOA, then it would be necessary that they pay for it out of the appropriations for the given area or the given country.

Mr. CASE. Does the Senator mean that if they should recover \$200 million

of these inventory values, and should distribute it under the authorizations permitted by the direct cash appropriations, part of that cash would be used to liquidate that amount, so to speak?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would apply to 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954 obligations which have not yet been fulfilled.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, what is the reason for the addition of \$300 million over and above the House figure? Particularly why should we make available \$266 million of unobligated balances over and above the House figure? That is a quarter of a billion dollars.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that it is a matter of opinion, but the committee, after hearing all the evidence—a good deal of it in executive session—relative to the international situation in various sections of the world, felt that we could well do it. That was not the unanimous opinion of the committee, but it was the majority opinion of the committee. The Senator from New Hampshire, as chairman of the committee, is reporting the majority view of the committee.

Mr. CASE. Did the committee determine that there was an unobligated balance of more than \$2½ billion?

Mr. BRIDGES. Some funds were committed, but not obligated. I think the \$316 million is included in the \$2½ billion.

Mr. CASE. Does the unobligated balance come entirely out of moneys heretofore appropriated for the purpose of foreign military assistance?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One of the difficulties in the whole field of unobligated balances is that the House cut back \$269 million, I believe, in obligated balances. We made available all the unobligated balances on the ground that they represent programs which have been processed, and in connection with which there may be considerable lead time.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is saying that the figure in the first group, on page 19 of the report, the \$2,500,392,283, is the total of the unobligated balances, and the Senate committee proposes to make all of it available.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; that is correct. That is for military assistance.

Mr. CASE. Is that because that was the total amount that was found to be in existence?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Whatever the amount was. It is a shifting amount. I believe one figure that was given us was \$2,200,000,000. It was probably in May when we received that figure. Perhaps the actual figure would be about \$2,250,000,000.

Mr. CASE. How did the House determine that the figure of \$2,207,000,000, instead of the Senate figure of \$2,500,000,000, was the correct figure?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know, as a matter of fact.

Mr. CASE. The point is, Was the House figure of \$2,207,000,000 of unobligated balances based on need, or was it arrived at because that was found to be the unobligated balance?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Frankly, I do not want to be telling tales out of school, but

I remember that on occasions when I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, after all the testimony was in, we used to say, "Suppose we take a 5-percent or 10-percent cut in it, and then come up with a certain figure." Of course, I do not want to reflect on what the House does.

Mr. CASE. I recognize that that may happen. However, at the same time, \$300 million is a very sizable amount. It ought to have been possible to determine whether the unobligated balance was \$2,207,000,000 or \$2,500,000,000. Apparently the Senate committee decided that the unobligated balances amounted to the larger figure of \$2,500,000,000. If it did, and if the need was determined as the amount shown in the total, why was not the \$300 million applied against the total need?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I doubt if it would be material whether the amount was \$2,200,000,000 or \$2,500,000,000, because the unobligated balances represent the programs that have been laid out and for which that money is to be used. As these programs move into force the amount of the unobligated balance begins to go down. Therefore, we have here a shifting unobligated balance from time to time and \$51 million of new money to account for the \$316 million on page 19 of the report.

Mr. CASE. The whole essence of the new look in the military field has been reprogramming, and it occurs to me that if, in the domestic military field, unobligated balances have been reallocated in the reprogramming and applied to a different concept of objects that need funds, the same principle is applicable in the field of foreign military assistance. If the Senate Committee on Appropriations was able to find nearly \$300 million more in unobligated balances than were apparent when the bill went through the House, the balances could have been properly applied to the new program abroad. The program abroad has been looked at again, too, and it has been reappraised.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is a very able member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions. I am sure he is familiar with the fact—I know he has made observations regarding it, as have other members of that subcommittee—that there is a difference between the date when the House acts on an appropriations bill and when the Senate acts on it. When the Senate acts on the bill more current information and later facts and figures are available.

That happens in connection with civil functions appropriations. At first a certain amount of money may be left over on a large project. Later it may be found that a different figure is the true figure. However, as the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Illinois have pointed out, the fact is that these are programs in being. Whether the figure is \$100 million or \$200 million, more or less, it is a fact that the programs are moving ahead.

It was the unanimous testimony before the committee from those charged with the responsibility for our defense and the working out of a program, that they would be seriously handicapped if the figures as they stood in the House bill were permitted to stand, with the restrictions provided.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from South Dakota has worked on the civil functions bill, and has observed the difference between a committed fund and an obligated fund, and he also served for a number of years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. It has always been my experience that as time went on the unobligated balance decreased. Here the unobligated balance has gone up by \$300 million.

If the Senate committee found that there was \$300 million more of unobligated funds than existed at the time the House passed the bill, the normal thing to have done would have been to apply the \$300 million to the total estimate of the needs and to have reduced the new cash by that amount.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I drew a comparison with the civil functions bill. After all, those appropriations go along under normal, static, peacetime conditions. Here we are dealing with a condition of flux and changeability. Wars have gone on. Cold wars have gone on. There has been increasing Communist pressure. Governments have fallen, and various changes have taken place.

It is entirely possible that it may be necessary to cancel a contract, for example, for project A, because a higher priority exists for project B. Project A would still be programed, but the money might not actually have been contracted. There are varying circumstances. The fact remains that the military and defense authorities have testified they urgently need these moneys, considering the world situation as it is.

Mr. CASE. I recognize the force of the argument that contracts may have to be canceled, but that would be the only way in which the true unobligated balance could increase as time went on, by recovering the freedom of the money that had been obligated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First of all we must start with the budget figure. The budget figure on unobligated funds was \$2,539,000,000. Whether the House found more or less, I do not know. In the language that is stricken on page 2 the House simply stated that not to exceed \$2,234,000,000 of unobligated balances may be used.

When we restored all the unobligated balances we accounted for the difference of \$265 million, which is seen in the last column on page 19. The House said, "You cannot spend more than that." We sought to place a limit on the unobligated balance. It shows up in the arithmetic in the last column. When we add the new money there is the \$316 million which the Senator discussed in the first instance.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a question or two.

Can the Senator tell me how much the sum was reduced?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the Senator speaking about the overall amount?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am speaking about the \$800 million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is lumped, of course, in one item. There is a \$700 million ceiling. I do not have the total figure in mind.

Mr. KENNEDY. Was it reduced at the end of the Indochinese war?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We did not handle it in that way. It is on the basis of titles and chapters. I do not have the figure in mind as to the Indochinese standing amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have a plane reservation for 6:15 o'clock, and I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the yeas and nays vote about to be taken, I be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate for the remainder of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The vote now is to be on the item of \$200 million; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mrs. BOWRING], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. UPTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] has a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] would vote

"nay," and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] has a pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has a pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] would vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

I announce also that on this vote the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—41

Anderson	Holland	McClellan
Barrett	Jackson	Monroney
Case	Jenner	Mundt
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Potter
Dworshak	Johnson, S. C.	Russell
Daniel	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Ellender	Kerr	Smathers
Ervin	Langer	Stennis
George	Lennon	Symington
Goldwater	Long	Watkins
Gore	Magnuson	Williams
Green	Mansfield	Young
Hill	Maybank	

NAYS—34

Alken	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Morse
Bennett	Hennings	Payne
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Purtell
Bush	Humphrey	Robertson
Butler	Ives	Saltanstill
Carlson	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Crippa	Lehman	Thye
Dirksen	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	McCarran	
Fulbright	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—21

Bowring	Duff	Malone
Bricker	Eastland	Neely
Burke	Flanders	Pastore
Byrd	Frear	Reynolds
Capehart	Gillette	Sparkman
Cordon	Kefauver	Upton
Douglas	Kilgore	Welker

So Mr. MAYBANK's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which my amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3 it is proposed to strike out all of lines 15 and 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I shall endeavor to make my explanation of the amendment very brief. The Senate committee had already adopted an amendment as follows:

Production for forces support: For assistance authorized by section 122, \$35 million.

I call attention to the fact that during the fiscal year 1954, according to a report prepared and submitted by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, the amended British aircraft program for fiscal 1954, including commodity support attributed to the overall defense effort in general and the aircraft program in particular is as follows:

Commodity aid under section 541 of the Mutual Security Act, \$55 million.

Military air program allocations under section 552 of Mutual Security Act, \$14 million.

Special aircraft program, \$85 million.
Offshore procurement, \$103 million.
Total, \$257 million.

In the item for general military assistance there is earmarked \$162 million, less the pro rata cut on the amendment which has just been adopted, which I presume will bring the amount to about \$150 million. This is earmarked for the United Kingdom, for general military assistance. Undoubtedly it includes money for the development of aircraft, along with other material and equipment.

On a number of occasions I have called attention to one of the serious results of our foreign-aid programs. I refer to the questionable economic practice of financing foreign competition with our own industry.

One of the glaring examples of the results of this practice is our own mining industry. We have seen how cheap-labor imports of materials from countries whose mines we modernized and expanded through our grants-in-aid have forced our own mines to curtail operations or to shut down completely. I have pointed out time and again that

our national security is being endangered when we are being forced to rely on uncertain foreign sources of supply for our imported minerals.

During the past week a story published in the Washington Post and Times Herald points up the results of our failure to control more rigidly the appropriations and the manner in which our foreign-assistance programs are handled. This dispatch reports that Capital Air Lines has bought 37 more British-made turbo-prop passenger planes. With the three planes this airline had previously ordered, the total is raised to 40.

This is another case in which we have financed the construction of an economic guillotine for ourselves. It simply does not make sense to use our foreign aid to build up subsidized and nationalized industries in other countries to the detriment of strategic industries in the United States; and there is no more strategic industry in the United States at this time than our aircraft industry.

American commercial aircraft have been the best in the world for years—and they still are. They are used not only by our own operators, but also by most of the airlines of the world.

The British have sought this market, and I have no quarrel with that. But I think it is outrageous to finance this competition, even indirectly.

An investigation has been made by staff members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations into appropriations for the support of the Royal Air Force. A summary of the report shows the following:

First. The effect of the support which we are now giving the Royal Air Force is to enable the British Government to subsidize the development of commercial jet transports, both passenger and cargo, to compete with our own aircraft industry and international airlines. The sale of the 40 British turbo-prop planes to Capital Airlines makes it apparent that competition is already being felt by American plane and engine builders.

Second. During the calendar year 1953, the British Parliament reduced the national income-tax rate. In our fiscal year 1954 the British Government added to the subsidization of commercial jet aviation, but at the same time solicited and received from the United States in grant aid almost \$300 million to assist in financing certain British aircraft contributions to the NATO air command and the procurement of aircraft for the British Royal Air Force.

Third. Several of the British planes which we are financing under the Royal Air Force modernization plan are unproved and still in the experimental state. It is a matter of common knowledge throughout the aircraft industry that all the fighters included in the plan are incapable of transonic or supersonic speed at level flight, and such has been the delay in their development and production that there seems to be no doubt that they will be obsolescent by the time they are all delivered to frontline squadrons.

Fourth. The appropriation we are being asked to vote is not true military aid. In reality it is additional economic as-

sistance to the United Kingdom in the form of budget support. All the evidence indicates that the financial gap in the Royal Air Force modernization program which the United States is being asked to meet is essentially a fiscal matter. It represents the alleged overall shortfall in necessary British funds, and in its inception did not identify specific planes for specific purposes. The record also shows very clearly that in the appropriations for the United Kingdom in fiscal year 1954 it was the intent of the Congress to limit economic assistance to the United Kingdom to a maximum of \$20 million. Do we propose to increase this by more than 10 times in fiscal year 1955?

Fifth. If the British can afford massive subsidies for the development of new civil jet transports, they do not need this additional economic aid to carry through their plan for the modernization of the Royal Air Force and compliance with their responsibilities to NATO.

Sixth. If it is determined as a matter of high policy that we should furnish fighter aircraft to the Royal Air Force, there is a better way of doing it with greater benefit to the United States, and to our aircraft industry, than by financing the production of untried British planes that in any event will so soon be second-rate.

Mr. President, that completes the summarization of the staff report.

I should now like to call attention briefly to an article which appeared in the August 16, 1954, issue of Time magazine, at page 90:

Britain last week rolled out its first truly supersonic jet. . . . At the news, most of Britain's newspapers went all out, claimed speeds of 1,000 miles per hour or better. Streamer the Daily Mail: "Fastest Yet—and British." But some, remembering how few of Britain's shiny prototypes ever see squadron service, were less enthusiastic. Said the Manchester Guardian: "The (Hawker) Hunter and the (Supermarine) Swift, according to Government statements 2 years ago, were going to be 'the finest day fighters in the world.' . . . But by midsummer of 1954, only a few Hunters had reached squadrons, and the Swifts were all grounded because of technical troubles. By the time (the P-1) comes into general service, if it ever does, it, too, may be behind the best . . . the RAF would do better to concentrate on fewer machines and get them into service faster."

It is my contention that if the British can afford massive subsidies for the development of new civil jet transports, they do not need this additional economic aid to carry through their plan for the modernization of the Royal Air Force. As a matter of fact, if we eliminate this appropriation, the Royal Air Force will not abandon its program. It will recognize self-interest, and go right ahead with it. This is one of the places where we can lift some of the burden from the backs of the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, when this program was called to the attention of Governor Stassen, head of FOA, during the hearings, he said he knew nothing about the program, and had not read the report of the committee and its staff. It is almost incredible that the Director of FOA

would confess that he had no knowledge concerning the indirect appropriation, and the allotment of almost \$200 million in the past fiscal year, to enable Britain to develop her commercial aircraft industry.

I believe in cooperation with Britain, and I sincerely hope the United Kingdom will be successful in developing both her commercial and her military aircraft. But, at the same time, I think we should realize to what extent we are spending these billions of dollars abroad to help countries which have a very small national debt as compared with ours—countries which are willing to cooperate primarily because they receive these financial handouts.

I think with respect to this item, which was not included in the House appropriation bill, we should recognize that there will be probably \$152 million made available for the military defense program of the United Kingdom in other categories; and there are several of those covered within the pages of this bill.

I appeal for support of my amendment, which would eliminate the item of \$35 million allocated for the production for forces support.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. As a member of the committee on this side of the aisle, I wish to say that the Senator from Idaho is eminently correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from South Carolina, who was present during the hearings. When we asked several representatives of FOA about this item, there was a complete lack of authentic and accurate information justifying this particular program.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Idaho is eminently correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I must correct my good friend, the Senator from Idaho. Governor Stassen testified at considerable length on this program, and showed a very great familiarity with every aspect of it.

This is not an involved matter at all. There have been two programs in progress in order to build up the Royal Air Force, and at the same time get some benefits for the NATO line of defense. There is involved in the program an arrangement between our Air Force and the Royal Air Force, which has nothing to do with the pending bill. There is in this bill, however, an item of \$35 million for the building of airplanes in Great Britain to be used as frontline fighters in Europe. General Gruenther testified at great length on the point, and he is extremely anxious about it.

When the estimate first came before the committee, it was for \$77 million. Later it was reduced to \$70 million. When the conferees finished the authorization bill, they provided a ceiling of not to exceed \$35 million.

The \$35 million the Senator from Idaho proposes to strike out is made up entirely in the form of surplus commodities. It is proposed to send those commodities to the United Kingdom. The British will then use their own currency. They will use sterling for the

purpose of raising their air force budget over and above what they planned in the first instance, and they will be doing it specifically at the request of the American military authorities. The Canberras, the Swifts, the Hawker-Hunters, and other planes may have had some defects in them several years ago, but it was testified that those planes were now proven. Certainly General Gruenther testified he wants these planes as front-line fighters. We are expected to spend \$35 million in surplus commodities, and in return the British budget will be increased by that amount for the building and the acquisition of airplanes for use on the NATO line in Europe.

What is the alternative? We can build those airplanes here and send them, along with our own pilots, to Britain. As between the two alternatives, I would prefer that the airplanes be built over there, using agricultural commodities as sort of counterfunds, and let them supply their own pilots. It will ease the burden upon this country that much.

If it is going to be argued that this is a subsidy to the British aircraft industry, I suppose that general line could be spelled out on nearly every item one may encounter in the bill, on the theory that if that amount of money should be made available to the British budget, they would be able to release funds and use them for British aircraft.

The fact of the matter is that our military authorities want these planes, and they see an opportunity both to put them on the NATO frontline and at the same time get rid of \$35 million worth of our surplus commodities.

Mr. President, the amendment ought to be rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, before some of the Senators leave, I should like to make a statement. I have had a number of requests as to the program for the rest of the day and for Monday. As soon as action on the final passage of the bill has been completed, I do not plan to ask for a night session tonight. The Senate then, under its prior order, will stand in recess until 10 o'clock Monday morning. The Senate will remain in session in order that Senators may request matters to be printed in the RECORD.

Awaiting action are a number of House amendments to Senate bills, and the concurrence of the Senate in those amendments is requested. Immediately following final action on the pending appropriation bill, we plan to call up those measures for vote. Other than that, there will be no other voting tonight.

On Monday—and again I call this to the attention of the Senator from North Dakota, although I have discussed it with him privately—we shall have the three contempt citations: Calendar No. 1827, Senate Resolution 280; Calendar No. 1828, Senate Resolution 282; and Calendar No. 1829, Senate Resolution 281; they will be ready for action on Monday.

But at 10 o'clock on Monday, when the Senate convenes, we shall have a call of the calendar, beginning at the end

of the last calendar call. However, following that, we shall have a call of the bills at the beginning of the calendar, and shall go through them. That will be the first order of business on Monday. Then we shall be able to see which measures are passed during the call of the calendar, and which ones remain to be acted on.

Thereafter, on Monday, we shall consider the contempt-citation resolutions.

Then we shall have two more of the anti-Communist bills: Calendar No. 1834, Senate bill 3428, the defense facilities bill; and Calendar No. 1833, House bill 9580, the espionage bill.

Then we shall take up Calendar 2261, Senate bill 2631, to prohibit the payment of governmental retirement benefits to persons convicted of certain offenses—including the Alger Hiss matter.

That will be followed by Calendar 2223, House bill 7130, the citizenship bill. I think those bills will fairly well fill our program on Monday.

On Tuesday, I hope we shall have the conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill, the conference report on the farm bill, and the conference report on the atomic energy bill.

If we are fortunate in each instance—which I cannot guarantee, of course, although I have hopes that we shall be, and that at least 2 out of 3 of those conference reports will be ready for action on Tuesday—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the distinguished majority leader gets through early on Monday with his program for that day, and if he then is looking for another bill to have the Senate take up, I wonder whether it will be possible to have the Senate consider at that time the railroad retirement bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is some indication that possibly that measure might pass during the call of the calendar, or that perhaps over the weekend an area of agreement might be found for some amendments which might be offered during the call of the calendar, and that the amendments might be accepted by both sides, and thus we might solve the problem. But that I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Assuming that does not happen, then, after the call of the calendar is completed, if it did not appear that consideration of the railroad retirement bill would involve too much opposition, could not the bill be taken up at that time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is one of the bills we have under consideration. There are, of course, others, including the unemployment reserves bill.

Let me assure the distinguished minority leader that there is no attempt on my part to avoid taking up the railroad retirement bill, but we have a great many other important bills to deal with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that, and I am not trying to press the Senator from California about it. But since he has listed the bills that he might wish to have the Senate take up on Monday, I was hoping he would include in

the list to be taken up on Monday, the railroad retirement bill—if it is not passed during the calendar call—so that all Senators would be on notice.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that, as I am sure he knows, when the majority leader reaches this point in the session, different persons have different ideas regarding which bills should receive high priority. If the Senator from Texas will bear with me, we shall try to meet this problem, and meet it as early in the week as possible.

If we can complete the calendar call on Monday, I think we may have some pleasant surprises.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, several weeks ago reported the omnibus flood-control bill. Congress has not acted on a bill of that type for approximately 4 years. Can the majority leader inform us whether it will be possible to have that bill brought up next week? I am sorry I do not recall the calendar number of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is on the list before me; it is Calendar No. 2026, House bill 9859, the public works bill. But again I was merely indicating the Monday program, because obviously the measures we can handle on Monday will depend to some extent on the facility and speed with which we are able to handle some of the bills I have already listed.

Last evening, in connection with the social-security bill with the cooperation of the distinguished minority leader—and his cooperation was particularly valuable—and with the cooperation of other Senators, including the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], we were able to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement which seemed to work very well; the time was divided, with half an hour being available on each amendment, and with the time on the bill itself divided equally.

So perhaps next week, by means of similar cooperation on the part of Senators on both sides of the aisle, we may be able to achieve excellent progress in the case of many of the other bills, and may be able to move along expeditiously and reach the public-works bill and a number of the other bills which have been mentioned. That will certainly be my objective, and I shall seek to achieve it. I know I shall receive from Senators on the other side of the aisle the cooperation we have been able to have to date.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. What is the plan in regard to action on Calendar No. 2010, House bill 7774, the so-called Government employees' pay bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is another bill which will be included in the calendar call. It is entirely possible that during the calendar call, amendments

which might change the situation regarding that measure might be proposed. Again, that is one of the bills in which a considerable amount of interest has been expressed by Senators on both sides of the aisle, and also on the outside, as the distinguished Senator from South Carolina knows.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask the question because the last time the question arose, the Senator from California said he would take up the bill with the majority policy committee, and that he would let me know.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That bill and a good many others were mentioned during the discussions today. With the exception of the Monday schedule, we have not finally cleared the other bills, because we thought there would be an opportunity, in the case of a good many of them—and in that connection I may refer to the bill relating to Reserve officers, as well as bills dealing with other subjects—to have some arrangements made over the weekend, and that perhaps certain amendments which would appear to both sides to be reasonable might be suggested, and thus it would be possible for certain of those bills to be passed during the calendar call.

As soon as the calendar call is over, on Monday, another meeting of the majority policy committee has been scheduled; and at that time we can consider the program thereafter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That bill was called during the last calendar call, and was passed at that time, but subsequently was reconsidered, and was returned to the calendar.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct. But at the time of that calendar call, no amendments to the bill were available or ready.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me inquire about the school-construction bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is on the list of possibilities. But, again, that will depend on the progress we are able to make on the bills that come ahead of it.

We have a great many bills of great importance. I almost hesitate to name some, for fear that would seem to indicate that they would have priority over others. In this connection, I might refer to the Colorado River bill, the bill dealing with the Missouri Basin, and bills dealing with compacts between States in connection with such matters. There are many other bills that are important to particular regions, particular areas, or particular Senators. We are trying to do the best we can with the problems which confront us.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield again to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to make a suggestion to the majority leader. I believe it would be helpful if he and the majority policy committee would prepare a list of the bills which they are anxious to have acted on before the time of adjournment arrives, and

then would give me an opportunity to review those bills with the Members on this side of the aisle—in the hope that perhaps we could reach agreement on a time limit on debate on all the so-called must bills.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not like to use the word "must" as applied to bills, but rather "priority legislation."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am using the word "must" bills. If the majority leader feels they must be taken up and we must be subjected to voting on them, it is a "must," so far as I am concerned. If the Senator can give us a list of the bills which he plans to bring up, I think we can reach some agreement as to time. There may be some bills as to which Members on this side would not make an agreement, but on many of them I am sure we could do as we did on the social security bill and save time, enabling us to recess at the earliest possible date.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR MUTUAL SECURITY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10051) making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the—

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I do not want to let go unchallenged the statement of the Senator from Illinois that the purpose of this amendment, the deletion of these funds, is to force the production of NATO military planes in this country instead of in Britain. The purpose of the Senator from Idaho is to seek the continued cooperation of the United Kingdom in making available some of the military planes, but to do so at the expense of that country instead of our being expected to furnish the funds for construction of military planes so that Britain may divert other funds to subsidize its commercial aircraft industry. I want the record to show that, because I have no desire whatsoever to force the discontinuance of the construction of military planes for NATO by the United Kingdom.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho. My remarks are addressed particularly to Senators who are interested in the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.

I read from the testimony of Mr. Stassen, page 122 of the hearings:

We are doing another interesting thing. You are correct as to our emphasis on the RAF. In other words, we feel that the RAF is a force of proven elite fighters. They are the third best air force in the world from the standpoint of power. With all of our bases around there, we want a powerful RAF for United States security reasons. We are helping to build the RAF and we are doing it in an interesting way.

We are using United States agricultural products. In other words, in this program we are asking for another \$75 million to back the RAF, and we propose to do it not with dollars, but by shipping them \$75 million more of agricultural products which they, having taken off rationing, consulted their own people, picked up their own pound ster-

ling for the food, put the money behind the RAF.

I really feel it is a method of working out a strengthened defense program with the United States asset.

Senator THYE. May I have information of what type of agricultural commodities will be made available?

Mr. STASSEN. It will be meat and butter and cottonseed oil and cotton and wheat, maybe some corn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President—
Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I request a division.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I was asking for recognition.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has sought recognition, and the Chair recognizes him.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] to ask for a division, and I am wondering if the division will come after the Senator from Wisconsin speaks.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I shall be glad to yield the floor to enable the Senate to vote. However, I have been yielding to Senators for 2 hours. I am a half hour overdue on work which I must do.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can understand, and I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that the Senator from Wisconsin is willing to yield for the purpose of having a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I shall be glad to do that. Mr. President, several other Senators have asked me to refrain from the short 5-minute speech I intend to make until they bring up their amendments. I thought I could do that. However, I find that 5 minutes on an amendment generally runs to half an hour, so after yielding for the division, I wish to make a very brief comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. A division has been requested.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has a very important amendment to bring up, and ordinarily I would wait until that amendment had been disposed of before making my remarks. However, I have a few very brief remarks to make before the Senator's amendment comes up. I shall try to keep within 5 minutes.

Mr. President, we are voting money tonight for the prosecution of a war which started 106 years ago. That war was declared in 1848. For the first 69 years of that war very little progress was made by the enemy. The declaration was made by Karl Marx. Not until 1917,

when the Kaiser sent seven Communists, headed by Nikolai Lenin, into Russia, did they make much progress. However, in 100 days those 7 Communists headed by Lenin took over a nation of 180 million people.

Very little progress was made until 1945. From 1917 to 1945 the figure remained at 180 million. From 1945 until the first of 1953 the figure increased to 800 million people.

We should keep in mind that the entire world population, according to the latest estimate, is about 2,300,000,000. So 800 million is approaching one-half of the world's population. Nearly one-half of the world's population is in chains.

From the first of 1953 until a few weeks ago, again very little progress was made, insofar as numbers of people in chains were concerned, but a few weeks ago we saw an additional 12 million people and a fairly sizable area of the earth's surface in Indochina go behind the Iron Curtain.

The question is, Why are we losing this war? We are paying for it tonight. We are about to vote money for it. Why are we losing it? It is perhaps because the money is improperly used.

In that connection I invite the attention of the Senate to one of the most unusual orders I have ever heard of during my service in the Senate. When I was campaigning against my Democrat friends, I condemned them for secrecy. If my Republican friends engage in the same type of secrecy, I have no choice but to discuss that, also.

Here is an order dated March 26, 1954. This order is 3 pages long, and I should like to have it inserted in toto in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Wisconsin explain to us where the order comes from, and who the author of the order is, and summarize for us its contents?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall be glad to do so.

The order comes from Mr. Harold Stassen, the head of the organization for which we are voting money tonight. The date is March 26. It provides that when the Presidential secrecy order—the order of Truman, and the order of Mr. Eisenhower—failed to cover a certain situation—in other words, when security matters are not involved—nevertheless the agency can classify something "For official use only," and that will keep the information from the Congress, and from the American people.

Let me read paragraph 6 of this order. It would be unbelievable, almost, except that it is a matter of cold record.

Paragraph 6. Here is the information that Congress cannot get even though we are voting approximately \$3 billion for this organization.

6. Information pertaining to administrative, organization, personnel, fiscal or operating policies, procedures and plans where temporary protection prior to firm establishment is in the public interest.

In other words, they say, "We will not give Congress information about personnel, organization, administration, operating policies, procedures, and plans." There is added the clause, as protection, "where it is in the public interest."

The order covers about everything that can be covered.

I hand the order to the Senator from Oregon. He has been a very active critic of secrecy in government, so I think he might be interested in this because of the huge amount of money we are voting for this organization.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, as the Senator knows, as a matter of courtesy I would not object to have any Senator offering at any time what in his judgment ought to be put into the RECORD. I hope the Senator understands that.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that.

Mr. MORSE. I should like, however, to ask a question or two about this document.

Am I to understand that it is the position of the Senator from Wisconsin that Mr. Stassen, under the heading of "Procedures for the Protection of Certain Non-defense Information, a Foreign Operations Administration Manual," is seeking to keep from the Congress, and I assume from the press—

Mr. McCARTHY. Correct—

Mr. MORSE. Information about the operation of this public agency of Government which is not classified information?

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me put it this way: I take the position we have been losing this war over the past number of years even though we have been voting whatever has been asked. The question is, why? I feel it is because the money is improperly spent. Now we suddenly find a new order telling us we can have no knowledge of how it is spent.

I feel we should not vote money for an organization which has been failing so miserably and which now says "Congress cannot know anything about our organization. We will take the money. We will keep everything secret."

I think that is ten times important, in view of the constant reports we get on incompetence, overstaffing, and the type of debris which there is in some of the FOA offices. I may say, in fairness to some of the individuals in FOA, I think there are some outstanding people who are even more disturbed than I am about this secrecy, incompetence, and debris piling up in the FOA.

Mr. MORSE. May I ask one more question as a matter of reservation, and then I shall not object.

Am I to understand what the Senator from Wisconsin alleges with respect to the document is that it is an example of Government by secrecy in FOA, operated by Mr. Stassen?

Mr. McCARTHY. Correct. And this is just the beginning, I am afraid. We are heading more and more toward complete secrecy in government.

For a while we had secrecy under the guise that it involved security. Here we have the head of an organization with no Presidential authority—I am sure Mr. Eisenhower does not know about this—but by fiat, issuing an order.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make one observation.

I believe this matter was brought up in a conversation with Mr. Stassen be-

fore the committee. It is my understanding that this order related only to that period when the reorganization was being considered, and that Mr. Stassen did not intend it to apply permanently, after they had decided on various matters that were in process. I believe I recall his telling me and other members of the committee that the manual was not intended to do anything other than to stop the leaks out of his organization, pending a final decision on matters which he was considering in the reorganization of his agency.

I do not wish to get into a big argument defending Mr. Stassen and the FOA, although I think he has done a good job in cutting down personnel. He certainly has done so with regard to the personnel abroad, and that matter is covered in the hearings before our committee.

By and large, I would say Mr. Stassen has done a very good job in reorganizing his agency. I never was conscious of being deprived of any information with respect to the operations of the agency.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I point out to the Senator from Arkansas that he is completely, 100 percent in error? He has, I am sure, inadvertently misstated the facts. If he would care to have the written record, at which time Mr. Stassen was asked about it, I have it. He may have it.

I think the Senator from Arkansas should go over this record and inform the Senate that he was in error. As I say, I feel sure that the Senator was inadvertently in error. I am sure he would not even remotely misstate the subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does the Senator want the record?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have the record. All I know is what I read in the record. On page 45, when the colloquy was going on, I was presiding in the committee, and Mr. Stassen had this to say:

It is not a classified document. It is a general manual that was distributed worldwide in all executive branch agencies.

Then, when Mr. Stassen referred to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, he said, "He can get a thousand of them if he wishes them," meaning copies of the manual.

There is one other thing. The record of personnel is in the hearings. Anybody who wants to read it will find it there.

Mr. Stassen, I must say, was responsive to every question that was asked. I thought he was an excellent witness. I saw no inhibitions. I saw no withholding of data. So I am a little distressed to be forced to disagree with my friend from Wisconsin; but I know what the record is, Mr. President.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. May I say to the Senator from Illinois, despite the deep respect I have for his ability, I am afraid he is in error. The senior Senator from

New Hampshire ordered Mr. Stassen to give the committee a list of the materials which our allies were shipping to Communist bloc nations, but which we would not allow American citizens to ship to those nations. In other words, the Senator from New Hampshire requested a list of things we considered strategic but which other countries did not bar from shipment to Communist bloc nations.

Mr. Stassen promised that he would have that information—I believe the record will show—the following morning, or thereabouts. That is quite a few mornings ago.

The only letter he wrote on the subject was dated July 22, in which he talks about tractors and industrial diamonds. I had pointed out to Mr. Stassen that the United Kingdom was shipping to Russia enough industrial diamonds to enable Russia to have a stockpile which would last for 20 years, and that if Russia did not have those industrial diamonds she could not wage war, because her machine-tool industry would die overnight. Not only did Mr. Stassen fail to give us the list of materials, but he made this statement:

Industrial diamonds are on the international embargo list as well as the Battle Act embargo list. They are, of course, one of the terms on which the most active smuggling attempts are made.

He does not say so in so many words, but the inference is that diamonds, which are necessary to the Communist nations' war efforts, were smuggled into Russia. He is not telling the truth. He knows he is not telling the truth. He knows that the United Kingdom, Great Britain, allowed and sponsored the shipment of industrial diamonds to Russia over the past number of years, so that Russia now has a stockpile which will enable her to wage war.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not through. I have not yielded.

I mention this to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in view of his statement that he thought Mr. Stassen was a truthful, forthright witness. No. 1, he said, "I will give you tomorrow morning"—he may not have said "tomorrow morning," he may have said "or thereabouts"; but I believe he said "tomorrow morning"—"a list of materials that our allies"—the ones we are giving money to tonight—"are shipping to the Communist-bloc nations." He said he could give us that information. Up until this morning he has not done so.

I may say, with reference to industrial diamonds, that the record is clear that it is not a case of smuggling any more than the rubber going into Communist-bloc nations is smuggled.

The Senator from Illinois talked about the forthrightness of Mr. Stassen. He was asked about the shipment of materials to Indochina. I cannot find the quotation at the moment, but the Senator will recall that he said, in effect, that not much additional was being shipped. I do not have the date, but, anyway, a few days later, after he was before our committee, he did not say in so many words that we were increasing the al-

lowance to our friends so that they could ship more materials to Communist-bloc nations, but, a short time after he testified we have a story emanating from his department, as follows:

In Greece, what we have agreed to is that as from August 16—

And he testified after August 16, I believe—

the present embargo list will be reduced one-third, from about 250 to 170 items, and the quantitative control list very drastically cut from 90 to 20.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that none of this information was given to the Appropriations Committee. Mr. Stassen had it at the time. He knew we were looking for the information. So I say to the very able Senator from Illinois that when he says Stassen was an honorable man and was telling us all the facts, Mr. Stassen apparently had an extremely bad memory, one of the worst of which I have ever heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I may say to my friend from Wisconsin, and I do not mean to be unkind, that I was in attendance at the hearing every day, every hour, every minute when there was any testimony going on, and on the basis of dealing with all the witnesses over that period of time I must reaffirm my statement that Governor Stassen was a forthright and a complete witness. I would do him a disservice if I said otherwise.

I think he said in the hearing that it would be necessary to confer with the Department of Commerce. I am sure there is money in this bill for personnel with reference to the whole control procedure relating to the shipment of strategic and critical materials going behind the Iron Curtain.

Finally, there is a letter of July 22 in which he sets forth in some detail the quantities for a period of 2 years. That information was adequate, I think for the members of the committee, and, being a member of the committee, I was sure when we had Governor Stassen before us some time ago when there was testimony on East-West trade and trade between the free world and the Soviet nation and the Soviet satellites, that he was very cooperative.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the statement which Mr. Stassen made appears on page 50.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out some testimony appearing at page 50 of the hearings, which I read:

Senator McCARTHY. Let me ask you this, Governor. Is there any reason why this committee, which is being asked to appropriate billions of dollars, should not know what our allies are shipping to the enemy?

Mr. STASSEN. The committee can have any information they wish in our entire organization. That has always been our rule.

Senator McCARTHY. If the Chair orders or requests it, will you give that list?

Mr. STASSEN. Certainly.

Senator McCARTHY. In other words, we can now get the list. Mr. Reporter, will you make sure we have this accurate? We now can get from your department a list of the materials which we carry as strategic war materials, but which the allies, who are be-

ing financed by us, are still shipping to Communist bloc nations?

Mr. STASSEN. Senator, you shifted the question in your usual manner. There are no such items.

Mr. President, there is one other item which I think should be brought to the attention of the Senate in connection with the document which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has in his hand. I read from page 44 of the hearings:

One of the things designated "For official use only," information pertaining to administrative, organization, personnel, fiscal or operating policies, procedures, and plans where temporary protection prior to firm establishment is in the public interest.

In other words, there is a prohibition against giving the committee information during the course of negotiations—

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator said I misstated the Record. Does the Senator claim I incorrectly read it?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in fairness to me I think we should have the Official Reporter read back exactly what I quoted. In fairness to the Senate, and in view of the fact that the Senator said I misstated that paragraph, I think the Official Reporter should read exactly what I said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Official Reporter reading what was said?

Mr. HAYDEN. Reserving the right to object—I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Official Reporter reading what the Senator from Wisconsin said?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona made a rather serious intimation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. While the Official Reporter who took the notes is being sent for, the Chair will inquire if there is any objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that certain documents be placed in the Record.

Mr. MORSE. I am reserving the right to object. I have 2 or 3 questions.

Mr. McCARTHY. I ask unanimous consent that we proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding by recognizing the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of asking the Senator from Wisconsin some questions?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, would this not be a good time to bring up my amendment? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot permit that at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am saying this for the benefit of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], because I think that in his reply to the Senator from Wisconsin he made the argument that this document is not a classified document and was not offered by Mr. Stassen as a classified document. It is not my understanding that the Senator from Wisconsin contends it is a classified document.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Illinois merely misunderstood the Senator from Wisconsin. I understand

that what the Senator is criticizing is that, in his opinion, Mr. Stassen issued a set of instructions to be binding upon his staff relative to procedures for the protection of certain defense information which he labels information for official use only, and by laying down these rules or regulations he, in effect, sets up a pattern of government by secrecy.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is 100-percent correct, and I am disturbed by it, because it may prove to be a pattern. If Mr. Stassen can do that when he is administering some \$3 billion, another department can do the same.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] stated that in his testimony Mr. Stassen assured the committee that this document was to be applicable only for a period of the organization of FOA. I do not know what the facts are. I have only read the document. But does the Senator from Wisconsin agree with me that there is nothing in the document which says it is to be applicable for only the period of the organization of the FOA?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not only is the Senator from Oregon correct, but the Senator from Arkansas is completely in error. What he stated is completely contrary to the fact.

I have offered to hand him the testimony of Mr. Stassen, so that he could tell me where Mr. Stassen made the statement. The Senator from Arkansas sits in his seat, reading a newspaper. He hears everything I am saying. He knows that if what he has said is true, then he can take the official transcript of the hearings and read to us wherein Mr. Stassen made the statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Wisconsin that a certain document be printed in the RECORD? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The document is as follows:

FOREIGN OPERATIONS ADMINISTRATION MANUAL
Subject: Procedures for the protection of certain nondefense information.
Transmittal letter No. General-37.
Effective date, March 26, 1954.

I. POLICY

In accordance with agency policy, it is the responsibility of all employees to protect certain types of nondefense information which are not properly classifiable under Executive Order 10501 and existing security regulations. To accomplish this, such material shall be labeled "Official use only" in accordance with the provisions of this order. However, care shall be exercised whenever the designation "Official use only" is utilized to avoid improper and unnecessary use of this protective device.

II. CHANGE OF DESIGNATION

A. As the occasion demands, all material now designated as Restricted will either be designated as Confidential or higher, if it meets the provisions of Executive Order 10501; be completely declassified; or, if it meets the criteria outlined in III. A., below, designated "Official use only."

III. DEFINITION

A. The designation "Official use only" shall be used on documents which do not require safeguarding in the interest of national defense (Executive Order 10501) but which require protection such as those containing information falling within the following categories:

1. Information obtained from business concerns which FOA is required by law to

protect; for example, confidential information on profits and losses and trade secrets (see 18 U. S. C. 1905).

2. Information pertaining to pending suits by or against the United States Government.

3. Information, the disclosure of which might adversely affect negotiations by FOA with nongovernmental institutions, international agencies, private companies, or foreign Governments by affecting prospective contracts, supply, prices, transportation, cost of storage facilities, or the like.

4. Information about pending investigations of allegations concerning employees or companies.

5. Information about an employee or applicant, the indiscriminate distribution of which might result in unwarranted injury to the individual.

6. Information pertaining to administrative, organization, personnel, fiscal, or operating policies, procedures and plans where temporary protection prior to firm establishment is in the public interest.

IV. PREPARATION

A. Persons designated by existing security regulations to classify material are authorized to determine the protection of material under this instruction.

B. Documents designated official use only will be so stamped at the top and bottom of each page of the document. If the document is permanently fastened or bound, the designation will also be stamped or printed on the cover.

C. Rubber stamps bearing the caption "Official Use Only" may be requisitioned through the Supply Section, Administrative Services.

V. STORAGE

A. Information designated "Official use only," except for cablegrams, when not in use shall be stored in a steel cabinet provided with a pushbutton type of locking device, a steel desk provided with a lock or a container of comparable security.

B. Cablegrams designated "Official use only" when not in use shall be stored in a steel lock-bar cabinet or a three-way combination safe.

C. Cablegrams previously designated "Restricted" when not in use shall be stored in the same manner as "Official use only" cablegrams.

VI. TRANSMISSION

A. Information designated "Official use only" may be transmitted in a single envelope through the regular messenger system of FOA or other Government departments, and in a single envelope through the regular United States mail within the continental limits of the United States.

B. Information designated "official use only" being transmitted to overseas missions or posts shall be enclosed in a single envelope which will bear the caption "Official Use Only." This information will be forwarded by Department of State pouch.

C. Occasionally it will be necessary in the interest of speed to send official use only information by cable. Where this method is used, the cable cannot be handled by foreign service local employees. (This rule exists for reasons of code security.) Transmission of official use only material by cable should be avoided and airgrams used in place of cables whenever possible.

VII. RELEASE TO PERSONS OUTSIDE THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

A. Official use only information may be released upon authorization of an office director, or higher authority, when in his opinion the conditions which justified the original designation, as outlined in III. A. above, no longer prevail.

B. Consideration should be given in determining whether information should be released to the applicability of 18 U. S. C. 1905 (see par. III.A.1. above) and to the possibility that other divisions within FOA or other Federal agencies may be affected by the re-

lease. In such cases clearance should be obtained from the other divisions or agencies.

VIII. RULE OF REFERENCE

A. A cablegram making reference to another cablegram designated "Official use only" must be designated "Official use only" unless in the interest of national defense, as specified in Executive Order 10501, the content justifies a greater degree of protection. Note: Reference in this instance is defined as the act of referring by number, symbol, date, or in any way which will reveal the subject matter of a cablegram previously designated as "Official use only."

B. In addition to the designation "Official use only" the United States Department of State will use the designation "limited official use."

C. An FOA cablegram making reference to a Department of State cablegram designated "Limited official use" will be designated "Official use only" unless in the interest of national defense the content justifies a greater degree of protection.

D. With the exception of cablegrams, each document, when required, shall be assigned the designation "Official use only" on the basis of its own content and not according to its relationship to another document.

E. An FOA cablegram making reference to a cablegram previously designated "Restricted" will be designated "Official use only" unless in the interest of national defense the content justifies a greater degree of protection.

IX. DESTRUCTION

A. Nonrecord official use only material will be destroyed in the same manner provided for in section 10 of the security regulations for the destruction of classified material. A record of the destruction of such material is not required.

X. ACCESS BY FOREIGN SERVICE LOCAL EMPLOYEES

A. Foreign Service local employees may have access to official use only documents, except cables, when in the judgment of the principal officers such access is required in the performance of their duty and would not endanger the orderly operation of the agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A request by the junior Senator from Wisconsin is pending, which was set aside by unanimous consent until the Official Reporter might return to the Chamber. Is it the desire of the Senator from Wisconsin to proceed?

Mr. McCARTHY. I will proceed until the Official Reporter returns and reads the paragraph to which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, has the Senator from Wisconsin completed his speech?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall have finished in a few minutes. When I began, I said I would speak for 5 minutes; but that was about 20 minutes ago. I shall finish in about 5 minutes.

Mr. President, when we vote for this aid; when we read that other strategic materials, including rubber and industrial diamonds are being reduced in number from 250 to 170 for other nations, but not for the United States merchants—and we should remember that our businessmen cannot ship those materials to the Communist bloc nations, although our allies can—we should recall that an Army communique of September 10, of last year, said there were more than 900 young men who were, as of that date, prisoners of war, or rather who were known to have been living and were

prisoners of war, unaccounted for, as to whom our Army rightfully asked for an accounting. There was the usual nose thumbing insult on the part of the enemy. Two days later, I believe it was, as Senators may recall, on September 12, Red China announced that she had 32 airmen who were shot down over Manchuria, and that she would treat them as prisoners of war.

The figure of 900 has been revised downward, but not the figure of 32.

So as of tonight, August 14, 1954, when we are voting billions of dollars to our allies, who in turn are shipping materials to the Communist bloc of nations and to Red China—tonight, at 5 minutes of 7, on the 14th of August, 1954, we know there are in Communist blood-stained dungeons, being brain-washed, American young men, not missing-in-action cases, but young men who are known to have been living prisoners of the enemy. At the same time, the Senate, with no restrictions being placed upon our so-called allies, will vote untold millions of dollars for foreign aid. Unless our allies will work with us, this will be a great waste of money.

I know that what I am arguing tonight is a lost cause. I know the Senate will vote the funds. I know that our allies will get the money. I know they will continue to ship the sinews of economic and military strength to our enemy.

But I felt I had to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate tonight to make the record clear.

Before I resume my seat, may I ask the very able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations whether I am correct in my statement that Mr. Stassen, the head of the Foreign Operations Administration, promised the committee that he would supply the committee with a list of the items which the merchants of the United States cannot ship to the enemy, but which our friends can ship to the enemy? Mr. Stassen, as I recall, promised that he would furnish such a list. Is it correct that as of this time no information has been received, except the letter of July 22, which deals with diamonds and tractors, a letter which I should like to have placed in the Record? Is that substantially correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct in that as of today the Committee on Appropriations has not received from Administrator Stassen the list of strategic materials which was requested, and which he was directed to furnish to the committee.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, there is much more I should have liked to say about the matter, but this is Saturday night, and the hour is growing late. Many Senators have important engagements, and important amendments are pending. Unfortunately, I shall have to leave the Senate floor. But I desire to be recorded in favor of any amendment which will reduce the funds for Mr. Stassen's organization. I want to be recorded as being against the entire bill when the time arrives for a final vote, because I

believe the Senate simply cannot, in good conscience, vote money for allies who, in turn, are helping the enemy. I feel that we cannot, in good conscience, ever send an American boy in uniform to war in a foreign land, if we allow our uniformed men as of tonight to be brain washed and tortured in enemy dungeons.

The time will come when we shall have to regain our national honor. The time will come when we shall have to say to every uniformed American young man, "You pack the entire power and honor of this Nation on your shoulders; and if a 'brutalitarian' steps in and puts his hobnail boots upon your neck, this entire Nation of 160 million will make that 'brutalitarian' regret his action for all time to come."

I have heard some of my colleagues in the Senate speak about the loss of morale in the Army because an effort was made to get a general to tell the truth.

May I ask those Senators—some of them are absent tonight—should they not save their tears for the uniformed men who, as of tonight, are in the Communist prisons? How can we hope for morale in the military forces if we abandon our uniformed men, as we are doing; when we are not only abandoning them tonight in Chinese Communist dungeons, but at the same time are voting billions of dollars for allies who are supplying the enemy with the sinews of war?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with respect to the statement I made with reference to paragraph No. 6, I understood the Senator from Wisconsin, when he read it, to have omitted the words "temporary protection prior to firm establishment in the public interest." I have been informed that the Official Reporter has the quotation in his notes in its proper form. Under the circumstances, I was mistaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that certain minutes of the reporter be read will be vacated. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3 line 14, in lieu of "\$700,000,000" it is proposed to insert "\$500,000,000."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, my amendment proposes to reduce by \$200,000,000 the amount of money originally planned to be spent in Indochina. The administration has wisely decided that the money will not be spent in Indochina. The defeat of the French forces means that there will be an election there. There is very poor prospect that the democratic side will win the election. In fact, there is all indication that they will go Communist. I hold in my hand an Associated Press dispatch from Paris, which I now read:

Despite the Indochinese armistice agreements, all of Vietnam seems to be slipping into control of the Communists.

The Vietnamese Army, organized by the French during the past 2 or 3 years, is slowly melting away into the rice paddies. Communist-led Viet Minh civic committees are

active in the south as well as the north, propagandizing the Red cause.

This type of information has come to Paris through diplomatic channels and through letters from correspondents on the spot which seem to escape censorship. News cables, both from Hanoi in the north and Saigon in the south, are either stopped or so badly censored that correspondents find it almost useless to file stories.

Within 24 hours of the cease-fire in the delta, Communist-controlled committees took over the government in the major part of the 7,000 villages and towns.

Dispatches to the Paris newspapers, *France-Soir* and *Le Monde*, received by mail, told the same story in many respects.

"We are the new government," said the committees as they moved into control in the section north of the 17th parallel, which was ceded at Geneva to the Communist-trained Viet Minh.

They came speaking of themselves as officials of the Vietnam people's republic, the pattern name for Communist regimes.

The correspondents of *Le Monde* and *France-Soir* told in grim dispatches of the rapid breakdown of a government in north Indochina which the French had tried to build securely for three-quarters of a century.

Local officials in large numbers simply fled their posts on the day of the cease-fire and caught the first planes south to the relative security of Saigon, or simply disappeared.

Mr. President, there is no longer a war going on in Indochina. It is well to point out that the administration was spending enormous amounts of money on that war. Referring to page 167 of the report, Mr. Stassen was asked how much money would be available for expenditure in Indochina this year. He answered, as shown on page 271, that the amount was \$1,177,900,000. Think of that, Mr. President—\$1,177,900,000. That is the amount of money that was to be programed and made available for the Indochina war. The Indochina war has now come to a close. Any efficient administrator would reconsider his program and ascertain where that enormous amount could be made available in other places.

My amendment proposes that the amount made available be reduced by \$200 million.

The bill originally provided \$308 million for weapons for Indochina. The only reason the amount was not larger was that there was so much in Indochina already. The bill contains the same amount as originally proposed for other countries in that general area.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that even if the amount were reduced by \$200 million there would still be available enough, just in this year's appropriation, to increase every other item for Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, Formosa, or Japan. There would still be enough in the bill to increase those items 50 percent, as far as new money is concerned. A reprogramming would make it possible to increase the amount threefold or fourfold. Therefore, I see no need to grant enormous amounts of money that would be carried on hand, and which could be spent in one place or another.

Congress has a responsibility under the Constitution. The Congress must appropriate money for the program. It

is the responsibility of the Congress to know for what purposes the money is being appropriated. I say we would not be wisely discharging our responsibility by appropriating untold hundreds of millions of dollars when we are not told how it will be spent. Persons in charge of the program were unable to testify as to how the money was to be spent.

If ever there was a program which should be studied, this is it. If there should arise an emergency or a need for appropriating more money in the future, Congress will be back in session in a few months. The President, after he has studied the question, can make a specific request in a message. Certainly the money will not be spent by that time.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to, and that we will reduce the item. By doing so, we would be bringing the amount down to the same figure originally approved when the appropriation bill was passed. I know some Senators who did not vote to reduce the item in the appropriation bill will now vote for it.

I recall that the very able and distinguished Senator from Georgia, whom I admire above all Members of this body, stated at that time he hoped that the Appropriations Committee would reduce the amount recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee by about \$500 million.

If there is ever an item in a bill that could stand reduction, this is it. It is loose money. It is not meant to be spent in the manner intended in the appropriation.

I am told that there may be more than \$400 million worth of equipment on dockside at Indochina. That is available to be shipped to Europe or elsewhere. In addition to that, there was about \$600 million in the pipelines that was programmed for Indochina, as well as \$800 million which was requested for this year in Indochina. In addition to that, \$700 million was asked for the use of troops abroad, with this Nation paying the expenses and French troops being used.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. LONG. I withhold it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. I hope the Senate will bear with me. I have a little cold, and my voice may or may not hold up under the circumstances; but, unless the Senate and the House of Representatives are prepared to take a completely defeatist attitude, I know of no message that could go out to the people of Asia, and particularly to those of southeast Asia, who are "under the gun," to the people of the Philippines, to the people of free China on Formosa, to the free people of Korea, and to the free people of Japan, which the Communists are making a mighty effort to bring into their orbit, which would be more disappointing to them than action on the

part of the Senate of the United States to make the proposed cut in this particular item.

After all, the free world has suffered a great defeat in southeast Asia. There is no question about it. Ten million persons who once were outside the Communist orbit are now going to be behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Other nations are waiting in balance to know whether or not the free world is to be prepared to resist any further Communist aggression.

To admit now, as the Senator from Louisiana would have us do, that the elections in Vietnam are lost, as well as the chances of saving the rest of Vietnam, perhaps Laos and Cambodia, and, by inference, Thailand and Malaya—I know of nothing that would cut the heart out of and the ground from under the free nations of the world more than the statement of the Senator from Louisiana and the adoption of his proposal.

I do not know that the statement I am making, when the temper of the Senate today is considered, will influence one single vote; but I have been in that area, not once, but four times, and I say that we could not cut the heart out of those people any more if we went in there with a knife and cut it out than we could by agreeing to the amendment. These people are living, not knowing from day to day when the Communist hordes are going to come.

Tonight, as we are meeting here, there are reports that over 100,000 Chinese Communists are mobilizing on the Fukien coast, in China. We understand that they include paratroops and others, who may be there merely as part of a cold-war threat, or they may be there to make an assault on the outlying islands of Kingmen and nearby islands, and then on the Pescadores and the Island of Formosa.

We do not know how long the Communists will honor the truce. It is my judgment that it will not be very long. As soon as they have digested this meal, they will move in, in my judgment, before too long. They are already increasing the cold-war pressure. They are talking about invading Formosa. They have already taken a puppet former premier of Thailand and sent radio messages there, indicating that eventually they are prepared to try an internal coup d'etat in Thailand.

So, Mr. President, I make a plea to the Senate. I am sorry that the entire membership of the Senate is not here, but I would feel remiss in the performance of my duty and my responsibility if I did not make this plea. I plead with the Senate at least to respect the judgments of Admiral Radford, General Van Fleet, and every other responsible official of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, and also to respect the judgment of the Secretary of State and the judgment of the President of the United States. President Eisenhower has been in the White House only 18 months. Senators who, year after year, without question, voted in favor of what the former President of the United States requested, when he thought the security of the Nation and

of the free world was at stake, should not abandon and desert the President of the United States now.

During the administration of the preceding President of the United States, I sat on this side of the aisle and supported the recommendations of the then President, in the Greek-Turkish aid program, in the North Atlantic Pact, and in other matters. When he felt it was necessary for the freedom of the world to resist the first overt act of aggression in Korea, I stood on the floor of the Senate—I was one of the first Senators to do so—and pledged my support to the then President of the United States for taking action, without which not only all of Korea, but perhaps Japan and all of Asia, would today be in the Communist orbit.

Senators can vote to eliminate this appropriation if they wish. Senators may send to the Far East that message, if they wish. But they will not do it with my vote. Mr. President, I say to the Senate, with all the sincerity I possess, that at this desperate hour in the history of the Far East, I plead with Senators not to make this additional cut, which will be interpreted by the people of Asia as action by America in "writing them off." That we must not do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to add a word to what the distinguished majority leader has said.

For 10 years now, I have served on the Foreign Relations Committee. We have tried to develop there a policy of knowing what we were doing. I, myself, have been three times to the Far East. I echo everything the distinguished majority leader has just said.

It is most desperate even to consider cutting this appropriation any further.

With all the vehemence at my command, I urge my colleagues to stand by the President of the United States in this crisis.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have tried to stand by the President in his recommendations in regard to the foreign-aid bill. I have listened to the pleas of the Members on the majority side. I think the majority leader just made a very appropriate statement, when he said we have to rely on, and have trust in, some persons in key positions of leadership.

I do not believe this is a partisan matter at all. I think there are Members of the Senate who have honest differences of opinion as to how much money should be appropriated, and also as to what the authorizations should be.

When the RECORD is read, I think it will be found that the junior Senator from Minnesota has consistently supported the recommendations of our Foreign Relations Committee and, most of the time, those of our Appropriations Committee, for purposes of mutual security, defense, and foreign aid. I have done so because I feel that they have greater insight, in the main, than do the rest of us, individually.

But again I say that when a particular Member of the Senate may disagree, that does not mean he does not have faith and trust in the President or the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense.

I want the record tonight to be perfectly clear. If there is any doubt as to whether this budget or this appropriation is large enough or too little, I want that doubt to be resolved on the basis of having adequate funds appropriated. I want the record perfectly clear insofar as I am concerned. I want the record to show that I trust the President's use of these funds. I do not believe the President will squander them. I do not believe that any officer of our Government would knowingly squander them. Congress has control of the purse strings, and Congress can make the appropriations which it deems wise and prudent.

But I honestly believe that when it comes to a matter of the security of our country, we have to place reliance upon our Commander in Chief. We have to place reliance upon him unless we feel that he has economized too much.

I have but one criticism to make of the administration, in the matter of defense and security, and that is a personal matter; it is one which I think all Members of the Senate know I subscribe to, for it has been announced again and again by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], namely, that there is greater regard for the book-keeping entries of the budget than there is, at times, for the real facts in relation to our security. That is a personal view, Mr. President.

I do not say I am right, nor do I say that those who take the other view are wrong. But I say that if I am going to take any chances, I am going to take chances on the side of being extravagant; and I am going to take chances on the side of having too much, rather than too little; and I am going to take chances on the side of being there too soon, rather than too late. That has been my position, and it is nothing new. On many occasions I have said this to my constituency in Minnesota. I have said very frankly to them, "If you want in the Senate someone who is going to be a pennypincher in regard to defense, get rid of me, because I am not going to do that. If you want to have representing you in the Senate someone who is going to try to cut \$100 million, or \$200 million, or \$400 million from the mutual aid bill, the bill for security and assistance in our own interest, and if you want me to be that kind of a Senator, then get rid of me, because I will not vote for it."

I wish to say to the majority leader that while we have had our differences of opinion, yet I realize that his plea is a sincere and an honorable one. I will vote to maintain the appropriation in the amount recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

By the way, Mr. President, later I shall suggest that all of us honor the statement made a moment ago by the majority leader—and I took it down. He said: "We must not desert the President. We must rely upon his recommendations."

Mr. President, when I get a chance to do so, I am going to offer an amendment which will fulfill the President's recommendations for the United Nations technical assistance. The President requested \$17,900,000. Not only did he request it, but his Secretary of State also requested it.

His Foreign Operations Administrator also requested it. His Director of the Bureau of the Budget also requested it. The Department of Defense also requested it. I am going to be right back of the President, in asking the Senate to vote for it; and when I make that request, I want all my colleagues who wish to honor the President in connection with these matters to rise up as one and join with HUMPHREY in voting for the appropriation of \$17,900,000. Mr. President, let us be consistent by doing that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as all my colleagues know, I have consistently fought against the cuts which have been made in our defense items. I have opposed the very serious cut in our appropriations for the Air Force. I have opposed the serious cut—I regard it as a serious one—which has been made in the appropriations for the Army.

This afternoon I opposed the cut which was proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. So I am very firmly and definitely on record as feeling that, if anything, we have done too little to build up our defenses.

I believe that what the distinguished majority leader has said this evening is absolutely correct. I cannot conceive of anything we could do which would do more to discourage the people of Asia, whom we want to be our friends, whom we must have standing next to us, and who must have confidence, trust, and hope in us. If we cut this appropriation now, we shall be making a monumental mistake. I shall certainly vote against such a cut, and I shall vote in support of the position taken by the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, at least I wish to say, in behalf of my position, that I have been consistent in these matters. I can recall that at one time some of our great Republican friends were leading the charge for a 10 percent reduction in foreign aid. I supported them; it seemed to me that we could make those economies.

I heard some of the great stalwarts stand here and say, "Oh, do not cut this; it will wreck the entire program and perhaps the whole Nation if that is done."

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I am willing to give the President and the Army and the Navy and the Air Force every cent that they can use effectively for our protection and that is all I am willing to give them.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has worked on these items year in and year out. I had the honor one time of serving on the Armed Services Committee, which at that time had jurisdiction of this bill. There was a time when we

used to assign the foreign-aid authorization bill first to the Foreign Relations Committee and then to the Armed Services Committee. I have had occasion to study some of these items firsthand.

The junior Senator from Louisiana was one of those working on these authorizations who said: "Show us what you want the money for. If you are just going to waste it and fritter it away, I am not going to vote for it; but if you can show us where you have a worthwhile program which will accomplish something, I shall be delighted to vote for it."

Let us look at some of the money we have appropriated. In this foreign giveaway program since World War II we have given more than a billion dollars to Communist countries behind the Iron Curtain. I am sure an eloquent plea was made for it, although I did not have the honor to serve in the Senate at that time.

According to an analysis made for use by Government agencies, the Congress has given away \$45 billion to foreign nations since World War II. In this military-aid program the Nation has given away \$19 billion. They will have on hand \$13 billion more for the same purpose if this bill passes.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana points out one item. Here is the item where Mr. Stassen says he will have on hand \$1,177,000,000 for Indochina. Mr. Stassen says we should not spend that money. The generals who testify for it say they should not spend that \$1,177,000,000. Every report we get from the press tells us that we should not spend that \$1,177,000,000, because the equipment is falling into the hands of the Communists. The Senate has just agreed to an amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina to transfer \$200 million of that \$1,177,000,000 to different areas, in view of the fact that we should be trying to save this equipment from the Communists instead of sending more in.

The junior Senator from Louisiana heard the argument about psychology—that someone's psychology was going to be affected adversely if we cut this item. Mr. President, where was their psychology when those people decided to surrender? We were trying to buy our way into the war every way we could, picking up almost the whole cost. We were paying 65 percent of the salaries of the French who were fighting the war, and still they gave up. We were paying for all the equipment and we were financing France at the same time and giving her economic support and sending our money to France to build equipment in France that our own factories and our own workers were capable of producing, at a time when we had 3½ million men unemployed in this country.

This Nation tried to buy into that war. We tried to take over and supervise it. The French would not let us take a controlling hand in that war. They decided they would go ahead and ask for truce terms anyway.

They asked for a truce, which was nothing more or less than a face-saving device, one which everyone knows is a defeat for our side. We will be lucky

if any of Indochina is left on our side when the matter is finally cleaned up.

It is time that we recognize that the American taxpayers, unless they want to send their sons to fight in Indochina, do not have enough money in America to buy victory in that war. It has been lost, and we might as well face it.

I do not like to say that is the case, but that is what has happened.

If we do not know how the money should be spent, let us wait and see, and try to get our money's worth for it.

Let us look at the rest of the program included in that. If my amendment carries, we will find that that item was projected to be \$583 million, with \$380 million of it as new money for Indochina. That is in addition to \$600 million they had left over for Indochina.

The Foreign Operations Administration will still be in position to reprogram another \$180 million into other programs all through that area.

Mr. President, instead of adhering to the idea that we can make everything come out our way by lavish, reckless spending of the taxpayers' money, we should try to see what we are getting for our money, we should try to see that the taxpayers' money is being spent wisely.

I am frank to tell you, I have serious doubts that the \$45 billion we gave away since World II has been entirely wisely spent. I am afraid that a lot of it did not accomplish much.

I am willing to vote for more foreign aid. I am willing to support this program. But I would like to see a carefully studied program, one where we know what we are getting and where we believe that the money which we are paying will bring dividends which will justify the expenditure.

That is all this amendment amounts to.

Mr. President, some say it will be bad psychology to vote for this amendment, but if the Senate does so, it will be doing the same thing it did 1 week ago when the Senate adopted my amendment to reduce the authorization to \$2,710,000,000. After the Senate passed that judgment, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported out a bill which attempted to appropriate \$3,190,000,000, which was \$400 million more than the Senate had expressed itself to its committee as favoring for this program.

The Senate has now agreed to reduce that amount by \$200 million. I would recommend that the Senate stick by its original judgment.

I did not see the whole free world fall apart when the Senate voted for the Long amendment last time. Some of the things we fear the most never happen. It seems to me we have a chance here to effect a worthwhile economy; that we have a chance to insist that we will look at these programs and know what the money is to be spent for. That is the reason the junior Senator from Louisiana has consistently tried to see to it that this money would be economically spent.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$9,757,621" and insert "\$17,900,000."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my amendment is the figure for the appropriation as contributions to the United Nations program of technical assistance, in the amount recommended by the President of the United States, \$17,900,000 to be used through June 1955 for technical assistance through the United Nations.

I want my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to note what I said, in view of what has been stated here within the last hour. The recommendation of the junior Senator from Minnesota is the recommendation of the President of the United States. It is the recommendation of the State Department. It is the recommendation of the authorities of this country who have responsibility for our relationships in the United Nations and our diplomacy overseas.

I particularly want those who feel that we should follow these recommendations of the administration to listen to my plea.

The amount was approved in the bill adopted by the Senate last Thursday night, August 12, and a similar bill was adopted by the House.

We are now faced with an appropriation measure which would cut out entirely that section of the appropriation for United Nations technical assistance to be carried on from January 1 through to the end of our own United States fiscal year. This is a strange way to change our long-standing policy on appropriations, and is mistakenly designed to allow time for a study of supposed overlapping in the technical assistance programs carried on by the United States and the United Nations.

First, let us take a look at the effect of the appropriation before us. To appropriate a half a loaf for United Nations technical assistance to me is a grave mistake. If we approve the appropriation of only \$9.9 million of the \$17.9 million requested, it seems to me we are telling the world that we are putting our faith—our whole faith—in atomic bombs and massive retaliation. I am not sure we can sell this bill of goods to what is left of the free world.

Let me explain the position in which this puts our United Nations representatives. This \$9.9 million will be just enough to fulfill the United States commitments through December 31 of this year. The U. N. pledging conference will be held in November. It will be difficult, if not impossible, for our delegates to make any pledge for 1955 if no funds are appropriated. I am sure you realize how impossible it would be for a new Congress to provide needed funds in January.

Thus, if we permit this cut to go through, it will provide the Soviet empire

a real opportunity to pick up the ball and open a propaganda campaign which is likely to endanger our prestige throughout the world. I do not believe we can afford at this point to be penny-wise and pound foolish. We cannot afford to abandon our leadership in these programs which have been so beneficial to underprivileged countries. Let me say, Mr. President, that right there is where communism grows.

There is no doubt in my mind that the free world feels a great indebtedness to this country for such outstanding programs as the Marshall plan, economic aid, contributions to children's emergency relief and other U. N. agencies, and support for such voluntary organizations as CARE, CROP, church relief bodies and other private groups. To augment these, of course, we have had one of our Government's finest expressions in point 4, or the technical assistance program. Generally, people do not like relief, but they welcome assistance in showing them how to meet their own needs better.

However, technical assistance must be provided not only through our own bilateral program. We must cooperate with other countries in a joint effort to stamp out poverty, illiteracy, and disease. We cannot expect our own program to get the kind of results possible through united action.

Here are one or two examples of the achievements of this multilateral program:

With an investment of \$40,000 the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization added \$24 million to the value of Europe's 1952 corn crop. It did so by developing a hybrid maize seed.

In Pakistan a U. N. expert located a new subterranean water reserve just outside Karachi. This saved the government \$1.5 million it would have had to spend to relieve a water shortage.

A small tools expert in Afghanistan showed farmers there how to increase their output by 250 to 300 percent, merely by introducing tools such as the hoe, scythe, fork, and hay rake. When farmers are shown how to grow better and bigger crops, they and their countrymen do not listen to the blandishments of communism.

There is only one country on the face of the earth today which seems to be concerned about an abundance of food and fiber, and that is the United States of America. All other countries are highly anxious to improve their crop production. When they are shown how to build irrigation systems, get the fertilizer they need, and break free from the moneylender's stranglehold, then a vital blow has been struck against communism.

Nearly 4,500 experts are at work in the United Nations point 4 program. The total budget is approximately \$25 million and is contributed by 72 countries. Ironically, 25 other countries have increased their contributions for 1954 over 1953, and few, if any, except the United States, have indicated they might decrease their contribution.

You will remember that this body recently approved a resolution introduced

by the junior Senator from Montana authorizing a study of the technical-assistance program. This should be very beneficial to us in deciding both policy and appropriations for the years to come. It would be impossible for us, however, to receive the recommendations of this committee and act on an appropriation measure at the next session of the Congress without leaving the specialized agencies of the United Nations without funds to carry forward their programs, and even worse, without any assurance that they could make plans for technical-assistance work even running as many as a few months ahead.

Involved in this appropriation are the technical assistance programs of the U. N. Food and Agriculture Organization, World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, U. N. Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, and others. Involved in this work is some of the most constructive work of American foreign policy.

Mr. President, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the very fine statement made by Representative JOHN VORVY, of Ohio, on the floor of the House of Representatives July 27 on behalf of restoring the full appropriation for \$17.9 million for technical assistance through the United Nations. Let me quote to you Mr. VORVY's statement:

This amendment restores the amount requested by the Eisenhower administration for the United Nations technical assistance program, all of which was stricken out by the Appropriations Committee. It consists of \$9.9 million to complete the United States' pledge for calendar year 1954 and \$8 million to fulfill our pledge for the first half of 1955.

What do we mean by "pledge"? It simply means that James W. Wadsworth, Jr., son of our beloved late Member, in a United Nations meeting when they were getting up the budget for this organization, pledged that we would pay \$13.8 million. Nine and nine-tenths million dollars of this was to be subject to congressional approval, because no one can pledge future action by the Congress. He also made the further proposal that from now on we pay 57 percent instead of 60 percent of the total amount to be raised. So that the amount in my amendment is 57 percent of the amounts contributed, not including the amounts to be furnished by the receiving countries. If the amounts contributed by the receiving countries are included, this amendment is about 22 percent of the whole amount.

There are two questions. One is a big one and the other is a little one. The big question is, Are we going to move out of this United Nations Organization at the time the Communists move in? They did not participate until last year, when they found they were losing out propagandawise because of the enormous popularity of this technical-assistance program. So last year the Communists and their satellites came in and put in about 8 million rubles, which, I think, is about \$1,125,000 in American money. Is that the time we want to bow out entirely through the back door from this United Nations Organization, by means of not paying our dues? I want to say that in my judgment we get more for our money, in proportion, in good will out of our contributions to the United Nations technical-assistance programs than we do from our own technical-assistance programs, where the expenses are more than five times greater, than the amount that is suggested here by the administration for the United Nations program.

It is said there is duplication. We found some in our hearings, but the duplication is at least intended to be in geographical areas and not in functions. That is, the U. N. will carry on a hospital program in a country where the United States is carrying on a bilateral educational one. There are 13 countries where the U. N. programs are the only technical programs.

This amendment will permit the restoration of the \$4,300,000 for F.O.A.

The little question involved is whether an activity important to our foreign policy should be cut off entirely because the agency disobeys admonitions in a committee report or a conference report. I admit the great power and authority and value of a report from the Appropriations Committee, but, after all, their word is not law. To admit this would give this committee, which is, after all, a minority in Congress, independent lawmaking power. In any case, the punishment for failure to comply with a committee report should not be to wipe out an important program which is part of the administration's foreign policy.

We should continue our participation in this United Nations program. This amendment, although not the best way to insure this, will help.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that what I am asking for is a sensible realization of the budget necessities of the United Nations agencies on technical assistance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In a moment I shall be glad to yield. We have been discussing other items that run into hundreds of millions of dollars. I am talking about a very little item. Our technical program in the United Nations will expire on December 31, 1954, insofar as our participation is concerned, if we appropriate only the amount carried in the bill. I understand fully that the House committee did not appropriate anything for this item, and I appreciate the fact that the Senate Committee on Appropriations has at least provided \$9 million plus, up to December 31, 1954. I do think that we ought to go into 1955 with some money, because Congress will not be back before January 1 to take up a matter such as this.

We ought to have at least some money with which to carry forward into the year 1955, so that the plans of the United Nations can be fully realized, and that our delegates to the U. N. can go there as delegates, not as observers. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall ask the Senator whether he heard the earlier colloquy on this subject between the Senator from New Jersey and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The committee felt that it should make an appropriation for the remainder of this calendar year, because the U. N. operates on the basis of the calendar year, while we operate on the basis of the fiscal year. The Committee on Appropriations plans to consider the subject before the next time we have to meet on this question, to determine what we will give to the U. N. for the first half of next year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey—and he knows

I am telling the truth when I say this—that if the funds are appropriated only up through December 31, 1954, that that will be the end of the use of that money, and we will go into January of next year before Congress can act on the subject.

It will be January or February before we can get a supplemental appropriation bill through Congress which will meet the needs in the calendar year 1955. The U. N. is on a calendar year basis, whereas the United States is on a fiscal year basis. I believe the least we should do is to sort of split the difference, and extend the appropriations until at least April or March of 1955. That could be done by adding \$4 million to the amount that is proposed to be appropriated. I would be more than willing to modify my amendment to that extent, so that Ambassadors Lodge and Wadsworth will not be embarrassed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I will be there, too.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and the Senator from New Jersey will be there. I do not want him to be embarrassed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. And the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the Senator from Arkansas also. We want our distinguished colleagues to go there in good standing. This is the first year we have ever done anything like this. I heard an impassioned plea made a few minutes ago that we follow the leadership of our President. I am trying to follow the leadership of our President. I say that the administration has asked for this sum of money. It has not only asked for it, but it has pleaded for it. As every Member of this body knows, the groups that are interested in these activities have asked that we make the appropriation large enough so that it will extend over into the next year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me point out that there is \$110 million provided in the bill for multilateral technical cooperation between this country and all other countries of the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think we are in perfect accord with the President on this point. First of all, we pick up the pledge of this country to the U. N. multilateral programs for the 1954 calendar year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We are in the unhappy position of having representatives there who literally commit this country to an expenditure and virtually assume the power of the purse. Later on they come before the Appropriations Committee and make the argument that there is a moral obligation to go through with their commitment.

We have tried to make it clear to them on a number of occasions that we will not do business on that basis. Therefore, I think they are more than satisfied to have us give them \$9 million plus, for the pledge, so they may go ahead with the plans for 1955, and then come back to us again. It is not too likely that they will run out of money entirely in the programs under the pro-

visions of this bill, and nobody will be hurt.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We shall carry out every obligation we have, and shall do so in conformity with the intent of the President. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that the record will be clear, the appropriation in the bill is not in conformity with the recommendation of the President; it is not in conformity with the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget; it is not in conformity with the President's message to the Congress on this matter.

I listened a few moments ago to the rather sharp comment concerning the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Louisiana was right. He has taken a consistent position.

The interesting thing is that consistency on this matter comes only when it is desired. The interesting thing, it seems to me, is that when the President's recommendation is desired then we must have it, but when it is not desired, then we must justify it.

I happen to believe we have never before, insofar as I know, used this kind of a budget for U. N. activities, and we ought not to do it at this particular time. At least I think if we would provide enough to cover the period into March, if we would get over the hump of the year into March, we would be doing the right thing.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I explain one thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota apparently is in error, or has made an incorrect statement. The Senator says that we are appropriating for the last 6 months of the year, and we cannot afford to have occur an interim period between the end of the use of that money and the time when the Congress can appropriate once more.

May I point out to the distinguished Senator that in the fall of 1953 our representatives to the United Nations pledged, subject to the approval of Congress, the sum of \$13,861,809. Up to now expenditures have been \$3,904,188. They have not had enough money to carry them this far. Therefore, the money we are appropriating now is not only for the remainder of the year but for the purpose of paying some 2 or 3 months of a back amount due.

Therefore, if they have survived that one lapse they certainly can survive another one shortly after the first of the year.

I point out to the Senator, also, that I think it is very important that the United Nations representatives, whether they be the distinguished Senator from New Jersey or the distinguished Senator from Arkansas or anyone else, should make it clear that when they agree to the United States contribution to this program it is a tentative approval

subject to the will of Congress, so that there will be no misunderstanding about it.

The Senator from Minnesota also knows that the art of legislating successfully is to find a common ground on which people can agree. The House appropriated no money for this purpose. The Senate was asked, as the Senator from Minnesota says, for \$17 million plus—the whole amount.

The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate felt that we should provide this amount to complete the program for the calendar year this year, which is the United Nations year. Then, instead of saying "No" to the rest of it and "No" to the whole amount, we held out the hope and belief that the committee could make a study of it. Then when Congress returns, and we have our first supplemental bill up for consideration, after the first of next year, if the facts justify it, as a result of our examination, we certainly have indicated we would appropriate more money.

I will say that the Senator from Minnesota is well intentioned.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator means to do right. However, inasmuch as the committee has done what I have stated, I do not think we would suffer any harm if we allowed perhaps a lapse of a few days or even a month, because we certainly know that situation occurred this year.

The Senator has made his case very clear, as to what he is in favor of. I assure the Senator that the committee will give every possible study to the matter, and we will be willing and ready to act promptly on the first supplemental bill which comes before us the first of the year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota, as one who favors this program, that we are doing this year exactly what was done last year.

I call attention to two sentences on page 9 of the committee report:

This appropriation is made with the understanding that no further pledge shall be made to the United Nations for the expanded technical assistance program by any representative of the United States Government without prior authorization by the Congress of the United States. This does not preclude the United States representatives from making recommendations to the committees.

That is what was done last year, and that is what we are doing again this year.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I request a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 10051) was passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCARRAN, and Mr. CHAVEZ conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MANSFIELD ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday upon this floor the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] delivered a foreign policy address which is worthy of the attention of every American.

I should like to call it to the attention of all my colleagues. It was made following a very important vote and following several hours of continuous session. As a result, some Senators had left the Chamber and unfortunately were not present.

This address, Mr. President, was pitched on the very highest plane of Senate debate. It was characterized by originality, by nonpartisanship, and by an earnest striving to seek the right course that will best solve our difficulties.

I have no intention of retracing the steps taken by the junior Senator from Montana. I merely want to say that I share his deep desire to eliminate partisanship from the issues of national survival, and that I am proud, as I am sure all Senators are proud, to be associated with a man who so ably approaches the vital problems of our time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, contrary to the earlier discussion because of the lateness of the hour, I do not intend to have called up any House amendments to which the concurrence of the Senate is requested. I think they can go over until Monday without any damage to anyone.

I shall be prepared to yield for insertions in the RECORD or brief statements, but I think the staff and the Senate have had a long week and a heavy day. I wish to recess as soon as we conveniently can.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

TRIBUTE TO IDA KLAUS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last night I made a brief comment by way of tribute to Ida Klaus, the recent Solicitor of the National Labor Relations Board, who has resigned to take a similar position with the labor department of New York City.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article with regard to Miss Klaus taken from the Washington Daily News of August 10, 1954, written by John Herling, entitled "Ida Klaus Is New York's Gain and Our Loss."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDA KLAUS IS NEW YORK'S GAIN AND OUR LOSS (By John Herling)

Uncle Sam, fancier of Government girls, is giving up his top legal career gal to Father Knickerbocker. The Federal Government's loss is New York City's gain.

Ida Klaus, who holds the highest legal post occupied by a woman in Federal Government, next week leaves as Solicitor of the National Labor Relations Board. She becomes counsel to the newly organized department of labor, now being set up by Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York City.

Miss Klaus came here as one of 10 legal geniuses in 1933—the only lady among this exclusive group chosen by the late Herman Oliphant, professor of law at Columbia and Johns Hopkins. Mr. Oliphant was officially general counsel of the Treasury Department, but he was considered the great Olympian of jurisprudence whose word was often law.

Mr. Oliphant chose the top brains from each of the Nation's 10 leading law schools. Miss Klaus was selected from Columbia.

After 21 years Miss Klaus' departure furnishes the latest dramatic example of the drift from Government. In the early thirties, as FDR had begun to strengthen Government, the problem of qualified personnel was the basic headache of the New Deal. So there took place a scouring, scanning, and a screening.

When Miss Klaus came here she found a woman lawyer had a tough time even in so-called enlightened circles. But—as men like to say—Ida had a man's brain. Her ability was appreciated, but slowly recognized.

She chose the tough path. No Children's Bureau or the Women's Bureau for her. Having moved from the Agriculture Department over to NLRB she landed in the midst of the grapple and hand-to-hand encounter known as collective bargaining. Her job as a lawyer was to help give meaning and substance to the Wagner law, fathered by the Senator whose son is now New York's mayor.

Then came recognition for Ida. When the Taft-Hartley law was passed Miss Klaus, as Solicitor—top law officer for the five members of the NLRB—had the job to advise the Board on Supreme Court litigation, on testimony before the congressional committees, and in general to advise on legal policy as it affected NLRB administration.

Her objectivity used to startle union and management representatives and Board colleagues who too often believed that vehemence might pass as a substitute for argument. But Ida apparently neither takes guff nor hands it out.

Now she has been chosen by Mayor Wagner, he says, because he wants to build a pattern of municipal handling of labor relations, useful to Gotham as to other United States cities. That's why Ida Klaus is given a key nonpolitical post to help guide the establishment of New York's new labor department.

There's a moral here somewhere. In losing Ida Klaus, as many another key Federal em-

ployee, the National Government, probably without planning it that way, has embarked on a giveaway program involving human, rather than merely natural resources.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY BILL

Mr. MORSE. Also as a part of my remarks I should like to have inserted in the RECORD, Mr. President, an editorial from the Gazette and Daily, York, Pa., for August 9, 1954, entitled "The \$42 Trillion Giveaway of Atomic Power."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE \$42 TRILLION GIVEAWAY OF ATOMIC POWER

NEW YORK.—Although the 13-day filibuster in the Senate against the giveaway of the American people's atomic power resources to private exploitation was front-page news throughout the country, the press played up the length of the speeches and the filibuster itself rather than what was said during the marathon performance.

In the course of the discussion (it could hardly be called a debate since the supporters of the Eisenhower giveaway either slept through the speeches or rested in the cloakrooms while a small band of public power supporters held the floor), the entire history of the 50-year battle of the American people versus the electric utilities trust was reviewed and the significance of the latest battle was fully explored. Yet remarkably few of the facts brought out by the public power Senators were allowed to get into the newspapers.

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Independent, of Oregon, who carried a major load of the filibuster against the atomic-energy bill which he said sells "the American people into a monopolistic economic bondage," commented on the press: "It makes one sad to note that the journalistic profession failed in its responsibility of reporting the truth and failed in its responsibility of performing its function as the greatest educational institution in America."

ABILITY TO DRAMATIZE

MORSE's ability to dramatize complex situations was responsible for one of the few facts in the debate that was fairly widely reported in the press. That was his estimate of the financial cost to the American people of handing over of atomic-energy resources to the private-power trust without regulation.

"The giveaway to private monopoly contemplated by this bill is equivalent to 16 times the assured reserves and 6 times the ultimately possible reserves of all the coal, oil, shale, and natural-gas reserves of the country put together," Morse said. "If we take the price of coal at \$7 per ton, this giveaway would ultimately stack up to some astronomical figure like \$42 trillion, or in ordinary language, \$42 million million."

This vast wealth belongs to the American people who spent \$12 billion in tax money to develop atomic energy. It was their "risk capital," Morse said, that "has brought the technology of the atomic age to the point where commercially feasible electric power is to all intents and purposes no further away than the time required to construct a few big generating stations. Here in the Senate we have a great responsibility to make sure that, when this new form of electric power takes its place in the country's magnificent energy economy, the profits on the people's equity in the business shall flow to them in electric rates much lower than private monopoly is willing to charge."

PEOPLE ARE MISLED

MORSE charged that the people are being deliberately misled into thinking electric

power obtained from atomic energy is still some 10 or 15 years off. Actually, he said, "it would be possible to start constructing a giant atomic powerplant tomorrow, which would be commercially feasible in parts of the country where power supply costs are presently high."

The Oregon Senator also exposed the fallacy of arguments that only private business is equipped to enter the atomic energy power field. He quoted Chairman Gordon Dean, of the Atomic Energy Commission, as admitting: "Few, if any, private concerns are in a position to place risk capital into large reactors costing \$60 million to \$120 million or more without pilot plant experience behind them; and few, if any, would be prepared today to put risk money over into pilot plants costing on the order of \$10 million."

SENATORS FROM SOUTH

Thus Dean makes it clear, MORSE said, "that the main objective behind the present bill is not to release the dynamic forces of competitive private enterprise, but to get the Government out of the power field while continuing to subsidize with the people's money the developmental work from which riskless capital will profit."

Like MORSE, the bulk of the Senators who took the floor to argue unsuccessfully against the atomic giveaway were either from the Northwest or the South, the two major areas where the full benefits of public power are enjoyed. Construction of the Tennessee Valley Authority in the South and Bonneville and other dams in the Northwest have brought those areas the lowest electricity rates in the country. The northeastern part of the United States, where there are no public power developments, has the highest electricity rates.

One of the northwestern Senators, WARREN MAGNUSON (Washington, Democrat), compared the present campaign against TVA and public power with the tremendous campaign against Government regulation of its activities waged by the private utilities in the 1920's. The private Power Trust in that period spent an estimated \$25 million to \$30 million annually in its fight against regulation and passed the bill on to consumers in the form of higher electricity rates.

"Only a little more than 20 years ago," MAGNUSON pointed out, "the Power Trust was resorting to every technical and legal device their fruitful imaginations could conceive of to render regulation ineffectual in order to maintain the excessively high-rate structure which in turn would sustain heavy water capitalization."

The Power Trust, with its colossal war chest, proceeded "to rewrite public-school textbooks, place teachers on company payrolls, inundate newspapers with lush advertising revenue, to influence editorial opinion," and owned Governors of States outright.

PREVIEW OF FUTURE

"Midwest Utilities Electric Bond & Share with its subholding companies, Niagara Hudson Power Corp.; Associated Gas & Electric; Columbia Gas & Electric; Standard Gas & Electric; Southeastern Power & Light—these remain as symbols of the utility holding-company age, which served the public by taking thousands of small investors on a buggy ride, to line the pockets of financiers who made a specialty of building fortunes out of other people's money," MAGNUSON said.

The activities of the private utilities in the 1920's are a preview of what can happen under the Atomic Energy Act, which sets up no regulatory safeguards. By the beginning of the 1930's MAGNUSON said there was more than \$2 billion of water in the Power Trust financial pyramid.

"This faked investment, which had showered largesse upon the inside manipulators, could be properly handled in only two ways—either at the expense of ratepayers by im-

sition of excessive rate structures, or at the expense of small investors through the loss of their invested savings," MAGNUSON said. "Actually, both danced to the power trust piper, and both paid through the nose. In the 1929 crash and the holding-company collapse which followed, thousands of small investors lost their savings."

NOT ANCIENT HISTORY

MAGNUSON reminded his colleagues that this was not just ancient history. "Yet," he said pointedly, "the high-rate, low-sales policy, which this financial slight-of-hand induced in management, even now has been partially shaken off only in areas where Federal-power policy has provided real support for federally generated power at low cost, and real support for public competition."

As a result of a propaganda campaign comparable in scope to that of the 1920's, MAGNUSON pointed out, this Nation's public-power program is being sabotaged and dismantled. In the Northwest, where the power shortage is so acute that in recent years it has been rationed and so-called "brownouts" imposed, there have been no new starts on public-power construction since the Eisenhower administration took over.

"The people," MAGNUSON said, "by means of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), the Bonneville Power Administration, and, more recently, the Southwest and Southeast Power Administrations, have been demonstrating a practical way by which low-cost abundant power can be wholesaled and transmitted to the people, at low electric rates, even though the private utilities continued to control the State regulatory bodies."

"This yardstick of low-cost power, together with the exposure of inflated writeups by the Federal Power Commission (a Government agency), have forced down electric rates all over the country, even private rates. With the Federal and public-power yardstick, inflated capital accounts could not be resorted to, so long as the Federal power program remained a vital alternative."

FINANCIAL POWER GREATER

"The Power Trust knows this. Against the competition of cheap Federal power, against a Federal geographic power grid, against priority of public groups obtaining access to Federal power, the Power Trust is carrying out a deadly and implacable campaign. It will never rest until it is successful, either in destroying the Federal power program or until it is itself decently defeated."

"With the administration now in power, the new campaign is far more dangerous than that of the 1920's—because it is armed with a myriad of new devices for reaching and capturing the public mind. In addition, the financial power of the combine far exceeds that of 30 years ago."

The charges made by MORSE, MAGNUSON, and others in the Senate debate have been underscored by Robert G. Lewis, a Washington representative of the National Farmers Union, in an article which has been widely circulated in the labor movement. Describing the threat as "corporate socialism," Lewis warns that a "totalitarian revolutionary movement"—comparable to that of Hitler fascism—"is being developed in the United States."

He points out that the electric utilities coined the slogan "creeping socialism" as a means of forcing drastic changes in the American way of life and to smoke screen monopoly's attack on such fundamental institutions as public power.

The breadth of monopoly's target was clearly outlined in a speech to the American Petroleum Institute in 1952 by Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the board of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. Moreell also happens to be the man selected by the Eisenhower administration to head the Hoover Commission task force which is planning the reorganization of Government activities in

the fields of electric power and natural resources.

SUBSIDIES ARE ASSAILED

Moreell traced such public institutions as free schools, public roads, income, and inheritance taxes, Government regulation of railroads and other utilities, Government licensing of certain businesses and public power projects to the insidious influence of Karl Marx.

"Since Marx enunciated his doctrine slightly more than 100 years ago," Moreell said, "we Americans have adopted in varying degrees—practically his entire program."

Moreell charged that acquisition of land "for public purposes" is "in strict accord with Marxist doctrine," asserting that "the public purpose may be an irrigation or flood-control district, a Tennessee Valley Authority, a Bonneville power project, forest land, and oil reserve or any one of a number of others."

Moreell assailed the entire scheme of subsidies to farmers as communistic and denounced the income and inheritance tax for transferring money from the wealthy to political adventurers.

It was a logical conclusion to such statements that Moreell should end by expressing great mistrust of majority rule and dislike for democratic procedures. "Will any thinking person say that a law is 'right' because a majority has voted for it?" he demanded.

The views expressed by Moreell are in effect the views of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the power trust and the men who control the Eisenhower administration, the Farmers Union spokesman warned. The atomic energy giveaway, vast as it is, is only the beginning for this crowd.

CITATION OF ALBERT SHADOWITZ FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, in order that there may be some business before the Senate, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1827, Senate Resolution 280, the first of three contempt citation resolutions, which we shall merely leave as the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 280) to cite Albert Shadowitz for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 280) to cite Albert Shadowitz for contempt of the Senate.

HOUSE AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILLS

Mr. MCCARRAN. Has the majority leader concluded we shall not bring up the matter of concurring in the House amendments to certain Senate bills?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; after consulting with the minority leader and other Senators, it has been decided not to do so tonight. The session ran much later than I had anticipated. I hope that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Yes.

OUTLAWING OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senate on Thursday adopted a proposal

which I submitted to outlaw the Communist Party as an international conspiracy designed to overthrow the Government of the United States by force and violence. This action of the Senate was a tremendous stride forward in the fight against totalitarian communism.

It is, therefore, quite understandable that the Communist leaders in this country have been attacking me and my proposal with a recklessness and determination which convinces me that the Humphrey amendment is in fact an effective threat to communism. Within the last few hours news reports appearing on the news tickers have been brought to my attention, which I believe ought to be brought to the attention of the Senate. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the brief texts of these Communist attacks printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK.—The Communist Party labeled the Senate-approved bill to outlaw the Communist Party as the "illegitimate child of McCarthyism" and "legislative Hitler."

The statement was issued by Communist Party headquarters and was signed by William Z. Foster, chairman, and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Pettis Perry, national committee members.

The statement said that defeat of the Senate bill was essential "if the Constitution is not to be McCarthyized."

"Thursday's Senate vote to outlaw the Communist Party and outlaw trade unions is the illegitimate child of McCarthyism and cynical election-year politics," the statement said. "World opinion, fearful of the McCarthyite preventive war clique in our midst, will correctly view this bill as legislative Hitlerism."

"... The Communist Party will not permit itself—and the Bill of Rights—to be destroyed by this unconstitutional, un-American, pro-Fascist legislation."

NEW YORK.—Congressional legislation to outlaw the Communist Party was denounced in a party statement today as a "legislative Hitlerism."

The statement called the bill, approved 85-0 by the Senate yesterday, the "illegitimate child of McCarthyism and cynical election-year politicians."

It said the measure was "not even rational, much less constitutional," and added:

"The bill attempts to smuggle through a labor union wrecking device under the Hitlerese device of fighting communism."

Labor unions and others were urged to "flood Congress and the press with opposition to this giant step toward fascism."

The party statement was issued by Simon Gerson, the party's New York legislative representative, and bore the names of national chairman William Z. Foster and national committee members Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Pettis Perry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to note the fact that the Communist Party, meeting in New York City, described the amendment as "legislative Hitlerism" and as the "illegitimate child of McCarthyism and cynical election year politics."

These Communist attacks are, of course, not new to me. Members of the Senate are aware that the leaders of communism here and abroad have been

attacking me and my activities ever since I have been in public life.

It is most reassuring to me that in the last 2 days I have received many expressions of support and encouragement from all over the country. Responsible leaders of our communities, leaders of business, labor, and agriculture have offered their commendation. Liberals and conservatives alike have expressed their agreement with the premise underlying my amendment—namely, that no international conspiracy against the United States with a higher allegiance to a foreign power has a right merely by calling itself a political party to cloak itself with the constitutional democratic protections and immunity that our society provides for legitimate political parties. The American Communist movement is not a legitimate American political party. It is this finding in section 2 of the Humphrey amendment which provides democratic and constitutional basis for the action of the Senate.

The Senate has demonstrated that a democracy can protect itself effectively and constitutionally against its totalitarian enemies from within as well as from without.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume that the Senator is aware of the fact that the Communist Party is not the only force at work in attempting to destroy the effectiveness of the legislation sponsored in the Senate, which was approved by a vote of 85 to 0.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Texas is eminently correct. I do not wish to equate the forces which are condemning some of this action, because they are motivated by different instincts and different desires.

But there are some rumors which seem to be prevalent in the corridors of the Capitol, and I noticed an item on the press ticker to the effect that an attempt would be made in the House of Representatives to water down, to modify, or, as some have said, even to nullify the action which was taken by the Senate. I have in my hand, for example, a statement from one of the press services—I believe it is from the Associated Press—which reads as follows:

House Republican leaders today sought to draft a compromise bill which would outlaw the Communist Party without scuttling other subversive-control laws now on the books.

They plan to offer the proposal to the House Monday as a substitute for a far more stringent bill whipped through the Senate, 85 to 0, in a surprise, Democratic-led maneuver Thursday. The Senate bill would outlaw the party and deny bargaining rights to Red-infiltrated unions.

Although White House sources passed the words that President Eisenhower opposes the Senate measure, administration congressional leaders fear the Democrats will make election campaign hay if the GOP majority tries to bottle it up in the House.

"The Senate voted 85 to 0 to outlaw the party," one House Republican leader said. "We can't let the Democrats claim that they tried to outlaw the party, and the administration blocked it."

I deplore the effort which is being made to put a partisan label upon the honest attempt which was made in the Senate to pass a satisfactory bill. Very frankly, bills have been introduced throughout the years to do what has now been done. The distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has introduced such a bill in the Senate; and similar bills have been introduced in the House of Representatives.

Many Senators had asked for action. Finally the Senate took action. It appears that after action has been taken, reaction is setting in, the reaction being to see whether something cannot be done to undo what has been done.

I simply want the leaders—and apparently they are the leaders, because they are the ones who are quoted—to know that the Senate voted 85 to 0 for the bill. We knew what we were doing. I want to have it made quite clear that the action which was taken was designed to strengthen the laws of this country against subversion and against conspiratorial activities and conspiratorial parties in the United States.

I was pleased to note that at the top we had the help of the majority leader and of the minority leader, and also help on both sides of the aisle.

I want to make it quite clear now that if anyone feels that the action which was taken was wrong, all he has to do is to get up and announce it. If there is anyone who will try to scuttle what has been done, we shall have another yea and nay vote when the conference report returns to the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish to have the remarks of the junior Senator from Minnesota to pass without a very brief comment.

I think the legislative intent of the Senate is very clear in first wanting, as a matter of public policy, to make it certain that the Communist Party is not a political party in any sense of the word, but rather is an international conspiracy, devoted to the destruction of our constitutional government by force and violence. I think it was made clear by the original author of the bill which first was before the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]; by the distinguished junior senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], who in turn added the Butler bill, in effect, to the Humphrey substitute, that there was no desire on the part of any of the authors or of any of the Members of the Senate, in any sense, to undercut or to weaken either the Smith Act or the Internal Security Act, or any of the other legislation upon the statute books, by which the Department of Justice or the Federal Bureau of Investigation is able to proceed against conspirators against the Government and the people of the United States.

I think it was made clear by every Senator on the floor that in the event there were technical defects, they could be ironed out in conference by men of good will, working together. That is normal legislative procedure.

I may say, speaking in my capacities both as a Senator from California and also as majority leader of the Senate, that I should be very disappointed if the proposed legislation should be returned to the Senate which did not contain material outlawing the Communist Party and carrying out the general intent, which I think was not partisan in any sense of the word, because the bill was passed by a unanimous vote of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield in a moment, when I have furnished my thought.

I think that throughout the country there is a widespread, and an understandable desire on the part of the people of the United States, to outlaw this organization, which is a conspiracy against everything which our constitutional system means to us, which is a subversive, revolutionary group devoted to the purpose of destroying us internally, and, which, in my judgment, at least, in the event we should be subjected to a severe attack at any time in the future would be a potential fifth column.

So I think Congress will expect, and, speaking as one Senator, I think the Senate will expect, that the legislation which is finally passed in the normal, constitutional, legislative processes will very clearly indicate that the American people have spoken, through their representatives in Congress, a desire to outlaw the Communist Party.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, I wish to commend the distinguished majority leader for his very frank, forthright, and able statement, in which I heartily concur. It is the kind of statement which we have learned to expect from the majority leader, who serves his country first, always.

I am not concerned about the Senator's statement, which appears on the press ticker, that none of us would willingly do anything to weaken the anti-Communist laws, because I heartily embrace that statement.

But the Senator is quoted as saying that he is certain that the Senate and House conferees can iron out the differences, if there are any to be worked out. We know there are always differences, and they must be worked out. We are in the process of working out differences on many bills. I hope that those who are at this moment reported to be making efforts to water down and nullify the actions of the Senate—and the news on the ticker tape indicates that there are some who are already saying that there are serious objections to the bill passed by the Senate—will take due note, not only of the majority leader's statement, but of the statement of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, namely, that before this Congress adjourns we are going to carefully review what has been done in this field and that we are not going to nullify it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I can say to the Senator from Texas that,

insofar as my voice will carry any weight, I expect to attend the meeting of the legislative leaders at the White House at 8:30 on Monday morning next. The statement I shall make at that time will be no different than the one I have made on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has dealt with the Senator from California long enough to know that no assurance is needed on that point. He knows the Senator from California will do what he says he will do. However, I understood that all the sources mentioned in the ticker tapes point to the fact that administration lieutenants have passed word down the line that there is serious objection to the action the Senate has taken. They also comment on the statements of so-called leaders, or certain leaders, to the effect that they feel "this thing must be taken care of," so to speak. I hope they will note the very strong statement of the Senator from California this evening to the effect that none of us want to weaken any law, but to strengthen it, and we want to do it in a spirit of bipartisanship.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Whether in the field of foreign affairs or at home, in en-

deavoring to meet the Communist menace, we should have the support of all Americans, recognizing that the only party of treason is the Communist Party, and that the sooner we can close ranks and face that menace, the better off we will be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want the record to be clear that without the help of the majority leader on the day we passed the bill dealing with the subject, it would have been much more difficult to accomplish what was achieved, and the clarification as to our purposes would never have been made so definite and so precise as they were made. The Senate conferees can go to conference knowing there was no intention to weaken the Smith Act, but that there was an intention to strengthen it. There was likewise no intention to weaken the McCarran Act. There may have been some weakening as regards registration. My answer is that Communists have not registered, anyway. There was no effort on the part of the majority leader or Senators on this side of the aisle to try

to pin the responsibility or blame on anybody else.

I join hands with the majority leader and the minority leader in standing firm for the best legislation we can get. There may be some minor differences, but we know what we want. We know we want the Communist Party organization branded as illegal. We want to make it clear that there is no room for it in our midst. If we do that, there will be no politics involved, and, as the majority leader has said, we will have put the country first. After that we will take care of politics.

I commend the majority leader, and I thank the minority leader for his fine assistance.

RECESS UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A. M.,
MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, August 16, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Need for Termination of Deficit Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 14, 1954

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a statement and various editorials relative to a resolution introduced by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEED FOR TERMINATION OF DEFICIT FINANCING (Statement by Senator BRIDGES)

A month ago the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] joined with me in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 174, proposing that the Constitution be amended to assure the American people of balanced budgets in the future by putting an end to deficit Government financing.

The response to this proposal by the voters of our country has been overwhelming. The man on the street has been quick to see its wisdom and its necessity. Over 100 newspapers, large and small, have carried editorials praising its purpose and advocating its enactment. Furthermore, Senator BYRD and I have received mail in such volume as to tax the limit of our already busy office staffs.

Pay-as-you-go government is long overdue. Each day that we fail to recognize and respond to growing inflation, the danger of further damaging our national stability and prestige increases. The people who must pay our Nation's tax bill, the same people who have sent us here to the Senate to repre-

sent them are aware of this danger. And well they might be for it is simple arithmetic that we cannot continue to spend more money than we take in and, at the same time, remain domestically sound and internationally strong. As one Illinois editor put it: "The main objective . . . is sound as sanity."

I am more convinced than ever of the need for quick action by the Congress on this resolution so that the way will be paved for early ratifying action by the 48 States. When you read, as the senior Senator from Virginia and I have, so many letters from every corner of this Nation, written by people in all walks of life, supporting our proposal, you will quickly see that now is the time to put our financial house in order; now is the time to restore common sense to Government.

In order to point up my contentions even more strongly, I append hereto a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 174, together with several editorials which have appeared in several newspapers throughout the Nation endorsing its purpose. They are a sample of the editorial comment in support of the proposed amendment and echo accurately the sentiments of the American taxpayer.

Senate Joint Resolution 174

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for the imposition of Federal taxes to provide revenues at least equal to appropriations, except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein). That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the

legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimates of the receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws existing on such date and his recommendations with respect to appropriations to be made for such fiscal year. Except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostility against an external enemy, the total appropriations recommended by the President for any fiscal year shall not exceed the total of his estimates of the receipts of the Government during such fiscal year.

"Sec. 2. In the event the Congress, except in time of war declared by the Congress or when the United States is engaged in open hostilities against an external enemy, makes appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year in excess of the total of the President's estimates of the receipts of the Government during such fiscal year reduced by any amount by which the appropriations made for all previous fiscal years beginning subsequent to the effective date of this article of amendment (except fiscal years during which the United States has been engaged in a war declared by the Congress or open hostility against an external enemy) have exceeded the actual receipts of the Government during all such fiscal years, it shall enact measures to raise during such ensuing fiscal year an amount of additional revenue at least equal to the amount of such excess.

"Sec. 3. As used in sections 1 and 2 of this article, the term 'appropriations' includes grants of authority to make actual expenditures of funds but does not include appropriations to reimburse the Government agency making such actual expenditures.

"Sec. 4. No motion in either House of Congress to adjourn for more than 3 days shall be in order during any period of time when

the Congress has failed to perform its duty under section 2 of this article.

"Sec. 5. This article shall be effective on and after the first day of the calendar year which begins after the date this article is ratified.

"Sec. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

[From the Exeter (N. H.) Newsletter of June 15, 1954]

Senators STYLES BRIDGES and HARRY BYRD have proposed an amendment to the Constitution that would require the Federal Government to maintain a balanced budget except in the event of war.

Senator BYRD has long been a powerful influence in opposition to efforts to increase the public debt now set at \$275 billion. He was successful last year in balking administration proposals to raise the limit to which the Federal Government may borrow, and it would appear that his opposition now will prevent an increase to the \$290 billion limit that the administration requests. Senator BRIDGES, as chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, must be considered as a strong voice in the opposition. He cites that a continuance of present United States fiscal policy for the next 40 years, or the estimated period that the Nation faces in maintaining a costly defense program would reduce the American dollar in 1994 to a value of about 12½ cents.

The amendment as proposed by BRIDGES and BYRD would mean that Congress at the close of each session, except in time of war, must balance appropriations with income. If appropriations exceeded Government receipts they would have to be met by the levying of new taxes.

The voices of economy are not entirely lost in the midst of the heavy spending of the past two decades. They grow louder now to slow down if possible the policy of inflation to which the Government has long committed itself.

[From the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of July 16, 1954]

Senators STYLES BRIDGES and HARRY BYRD are following sound business judgment in their proposal of a constitutional amendment to put the Government on a pay-as-you-go basis, except in time of war.

BRIDGES sizes the situation up correctly when he says that the Nation will continue for many years to carry a costly defense load. This, therefore, ceases to be an emergency and has become the normal permanent status. It must be recognized as such, which means that appropriations must be made to cover such spending, instead of permitting the national debt to grow indefinitely.

The national debt is now almost \$275 billion—a gigantic sum. To keep adding to that debt as is being done today is suicidal. It is a grave injustice to coming generations, who must carry that load as well as the problem of their own day.

Of late the National Government has been an agency for spending without any real regard for solvency. The taxpayer's money is poured out recklessly, and then if political demands exceed receipts, more funds are borrowed. It surely is time there was a jacking up. The only form that can take is to demand a balanced budget.

No one can deny, as Senator BRIDGES asserts, that emergencies of great magnitude that strike the Nation unexpectedly must be dealt with by heroic means, whatever the financial cost may be. But we should not go on indefinitely pasting an emergency label on the whole course of time. We must not forget also that Government borrowing and the piling up of a costly debt have helped

to cut the value of the dollar. Today it has about half of the value of 20 years ago. This process must not be allowed to go on indefinitely, and to accelerate its shrinkage as the national debt climbs.

BRIDGES was right when he declared that "to insure monetary stability we must put an end to the practice of financing Federal operations through an interest-bearing charge account that is never paid and upon which our Government has come to depend." President Eisenhower promised in the election campaign to do something about it, but his administration has not got very far. Now let's have a showdown and settle the matter by ruling that the Government must pay its way in peacetime and no fooling about it.

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune of July 18, 1954]

FOR REAL REFORM

The enforced Federal budget balancing proposed by United States Senators STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire Republican, and HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, deserves serious congressional attention. They have introduced a resolution for amendment of the Constitution for that purpose. Senator BRIDGES is chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Senator BYRD heads the Joint Congressional Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures. Those official positions enhance the appearance of authoritative judgment of the Federal fiscal situation. The fact that the resolution has bipartisan sponsorship makes it even more practically impressive.

If the Constitution were amended on the pattern proposed by those two Senators, Federal revenues would be estimated in advance by the executive department as at present. If Congress voted for appropriations in excess of the estimated revenues, congressional adjournment would be forbidden until taxes to keep the budget balanced also were voted. Only when the United States was involved in war, with or without a formal declaration by Congress, would the constitutional compulsion for budget balancing be suspended. In wartime, of course, the taxes to match expenditures could be literally crushing. This has been taken into account by Senators BYRD and BRIDGES.

The unbalanced Federal budget has become a dangerous way of life in the United States in the last two decades. Senator BYRD remarks that the Federal or national debt is equal to all of the accessible physical assets of the Nation. This year Congress was asked, he added, to appropriate \$56 billion, although unexpended balances of previous appropriations total \$85,900,000,000. In other words, the Government might spend \$143,200,000,000 if Congress acceded to the current appropriations request.

Remarking that the value of the dollar and the Nation's security are threatened by this condition, Senator BRIDGES states that crisis borrowing and emergency borrowing, except in wartime, must be stopped. "The bottomless purse in the hands of a Socialist-minded bureaucracy," he says, "is the ideal weapon with which to break down the virtues of thrift and industry and destroy the self-sufficiency and personal initiative of the people." This "fantastic charge account" which has been a major factor in Federal Government spending and the debt increase in the last 20 years is "a form of invisible taxation—a secret capital levy—upon all of the people."

It is reasonably plain that voluntary abstention by the Government cannot be anticipated. Enforced budget balancing, involving either economy on taxes that would make all citizens more sensitive to the full meaning of Government spending projects, is the only remedy. As a promoter of economy, the Bridges-Byrd resolution is excep-

tionally promising. Full-scale debate on it in Congress should have great educational effect. Passage of the resolution to the States and reasonably prompt action on it by the legislatures would decisively resolve this vitally important issue.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of July 26, 1954]

A GOOD IDEA DOOMED FOR AX

Another noble idea is headed for the ashcan or the ax, as you like it. Reference is had to a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States forbidding the Federal Government to operate by deficit spending in peacetime. The first noble experiment was the proposed celebrated Bricker amendment, making it illegal to sign treaties with other nations if the provisions of such documents violate existing law.

Take your own case. Say you earn \$375 per month. How long can you go on spending \$376 a month and get by? Yet the Government is doing just that. What a strange state of affairs it is, we must pass laws making us stay within all bounds of sanity regarding money matters.

Thanks to HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, and W. STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, two United States Senators, who propose a commonsense limitation on spending. Every taxpayer in America ought to send BYRD and BRIDGES a bouquet. What these two ordinary, hard-headed lawmakers want is a constitutional amendment prohibiting the President's budget proposing the spending of more than the estimated receipts for the next fiscal year.

The idea has plenty of merit, but the spenders will knock it in the head. The deficit for the fiscal year just ended June 30, was \$3 billion. It is said it will be much greater when we look at the books on June 30, 1955. We'll bet a dollar to a nickel it will.

The national debt now is crowding the legal limit of \$275 billion. There are strong notions underway in Washington to boost that figure still more. They ought to run such goofs out of office. All that's needed to inflate the \$275 billion mark is a bill approved by Congress. It will encounter vigorous opposition, but observers of the Washington scene predict its passage.

Already opponents have taken one healthy swing with the ax on the Byrd-Bridges idea. It is said that in peacetime it frequently becomes necessary to spend for defense and the possibility of war. Under such circumstances the administration—Republican or Democrat—might be pinched considerably on spending for security. That's a lot of balderdash. The amendment can be so put together as to preclude the element of danger in a time of crisis.

The main objective sought by Senators BYRD and BRIDGES is as sound as sanity. Not only is it wise to put the clamps on a soaring debt, but it is absolutely necessary unless we are willing to see the Federal debt puncture the sky and so precipitate financial disaster upon the Nation.

The present debt of \$275 billion is appalling. It will take this generation and a good many more to put the Federal Government back on the black side of the ledger. It will take God only knows how many years to balance our books, if indeed this Nation ever does without resorting to repudiation of governmental obligations. That would be ruin, also.

Lend Senators BYRD and BRIDGES your very best punch. Hope, fervently, they may put their proposal through the Congress. It will be a tough fight. There still are a number of New Deal Demos around, augmented by Republican big spenders, whose main interest seems to be in spreading the power of the Federal Government over ever-widening areas. Enough of that.—H. F. W.

[From the Durham (N. C.) Sun of July 19, 1954]

POWERFUL ARGUMENT

The proposal of Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, that the Constitution be amended to provide for a balanced budget may not be a pleasant thought for some Members of Congress or for some executive leaders but it has much to recommend it. It is an application of the pay-as-you-go principle.

Senator BRIDGES' amendment would require that revenues must be provided by any Congress to match any appropriations it may make. It would eliminate deficit spending; would provide that the Government spend only so much money as it may expect to have to spend.

Latitude in times of national crisis, however, is provided. The restriction would not apply in any time of war or in any period of open hostilities against an external enemy. What would happen in the event of the need of any sudden buildup toward war? There would have to be, presumably, a sudden buildup in revenues to pay for the expenditures.

There will be some strenuous opposition among the Members of Senate and House; no doubt of that. There are Representatives and Senators who are impatient of any check on their pet spending schemes and many are apostles of the system of spending today and letting tomorrow take care of the bills. They may not be here tomorrow and, in any event, "tomorrow is another day."

Senator BRIDGES' resolution grows out of the failure of even a conservative Republican Congress to move toward a balanced budget and the pressure being exerted for another lifting of the national debt limit. The deficit for the year ending June 30 was about \$3 billion. This year, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, says, the deficit will be greater instead of smaller because taxes have been reduced faster than expenditures. Moreover, although Senator BYRD said nothing of that, taxes have been reduced for those more able to pay rather than for the great body of Americans.

Senator BYRD, in an address in the Senate last week, stoutly supported the Bridges amendment and advanced at least one powerful argument in its favor. The ban on deficit spending, said Senator BYRD, "would be an effective deterrent on nonessential spending."

It would, indeed. He has a strong point there. Congress is persuaded into excessive spending by pressure groups; and succumbs because it is aware that the beneficiaries will be pleased and because the rest of the country will not complain too much. It will not complain too much because, under deficit spending the day of reckoning is postponed and because it will not think the thing through. Besides other pressure groups conclude that they may want some "gravy" of their own some day.

If, however, the Congress is required to find the money for the additional expenditures and forced to levy additional taxes for the spending which goes beyond available revenues, it will be impelled to pause; for the citizen does not utter louder cries of anguish than when another tax is being added.

[From the Bridgeton (N. J.) News of July 17, 1954]

WOULD CURB SPENDING

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, and Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, are collaborating on an amendment to the Constitution, the purpose of which is to put an effective curb on Government spending.

This amendment, which if passed by Congress and ratified by the required number

of States, would put an end to all headaches over balancing the budget for under the amendment it would balance itself.

The purpose of this amendment is to forbid any administration to spend more in any one year than the estimated receipts for that year. The budget and receipts would have to balance. In short, the Federal Government would have to be conducted on a pay-as-you-go basis. This is good common sense and there is no reason why the Government should not be conducted on that basis.

These two men are not dreamers, but men who have been close students of our financial situation and have been earnest advocates of bringing our financial situation into balance. Senator BYRD, who is a successful businessman, has long since won the reputation of being an expert in Government financial affairs and of having such facts and figures at his fingertips.

In discussing the proposed amendment, Senator BRIDGES said something must be done to set our financial house in order or else our national stability will be endangered and our national prestige shaken.

This statement by Senator BRIDGES is not overdrawn by any means and coincides with the views of these wise financiers of the Nation, and is the reason both of these men oppose any increase in the debt limit.

We were promised that the Republicans would balance the budget if placed in power. At the end of the first year of the Eisenhower administration the budget remained unbalanced, the excuse being that it was impossible owing to commitments of the Truman reign. The second year of the Eisenhower administration finds the budget \$3 billion out of balance, and it is predicted the next year will find the situation even worse. So it is apparent that some such drastic step as the proposed amendment must be taken to insure the country financially.

No action on this proposed amendment will be taken until the next session of Congress and it may find the going hard, as the spenders will oppose any effort to put a curb on them, but once the amendment comes before Congress the people should rally so overwhelmingly in its support that Congress will not dare to fail to approve it. Once through Congress there is no question of its approval by the necessary number of States, for the people are tired of their Government being continually billions of dollars in the red and of the mounting of debt under which they are laboring.—W. E. M.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald of July 20, 1954]

IN TIME OF PEACE, PAY CASH—THAT'S BYRD-BRIDGES PLAN

Democratic Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and Republican Chairman STYLES BRIDGES, of the Senate Finance Committee, are joint sponsors of a proposed constitutional amendment which, in the interests of America, should be submitted and adopted in jig time.

In brief, this amendment would prohibit deficit spending. It would require Congress to levy taxes to cover the entire amount of its appropriations every year.

As Senator BYRD explains it, the amendment would not be applicable "during periods when the United States is engaged in war declared by Congress or in open hostilities against an external enemy."

But in times of peace—no deficits. Is there anything wrong with that? Is there any reason why this wondrously rich country should keep running farther and farther into debt, even in years of great prosperity? We think most Americans would agree that there is none. We think the Byrd-Bridges amendment, if submitted, would be adopted virtually by acclamation.

The proposed amendment is only part of Senator BYRD's personal program of things that must be done "if we are to preserve our

solvency." He recommends these four moves:

1. Balance the budget by reducing spending.

2. Hold the existing debt ceiling at \$275 billion. "This is more than enough for us to owe."

3. Reduce taxes after reducing expenditures; "it does not make sense to borrow money to reduce taxes."

4. Short of a national emergency, there can and should be a moratorium in all new spending programs until the Federal Government is showing a budget surplus.

Here again we think there would be very little difference of opinion among those Americans who honor simple arithmetic above socialistic theories. The wonder is that so few men, once they are elected to Congress and move to Washington, actually vote the way any rational and patriotic American ought to vote.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Banner of July 20, 1954]

BYRD-BRIDGES FORMULA: IF DEFICITS WERE ILLEGAL, BUDGET WOULD BALANCE

It isn't as easy—and not always as spectacular—to get out of debt as to get in. The New Deal and its offspring the Fair Deal made a big splash with their red ink, operating on the theory that prosperity came that way and that the Federal debt didn't matter because "after all, we owe it to ourselves."

With only four exceptions, Senator HARRY BYRD points out, the Government of the United States has operated in the red for 25 years, and a balanced budget is not yet in sight. The deficit for the fiscal year ended June 30 was approximately \$3 billion; and he warns that this year's deficit will be higher because taxes have been reduced faster than expenditures.

The Eisenhower administration made a substantial dent in the deficit of last year. By the budget recommended by Harry S. Truman (his last one) the amount of red ink for fiscal 1954 would have been \$9 billion. But the Government still is spending in excess of income because Congress has deleted some revenues without a corresponding deletion on the spending end of the ledger. So the debt mounts.

Specifically the bipartisan economy—or budget balancing—plan introduced by Senators BYRD, of Virginia, and BRIDGES, of New Hampshire (chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee), provides:

Under section 1 the President, at the opening of each session of Congress, would submit a budget setting forth both appropriation recommendations and revenue estimates, but the recommended appropriations shall not exceed estimated revenue under tax laws existing at the time.

If, in any session, Congress enacts appropriations which, in combination with any deficit carried over from the previous year, exceed the revenue estimates, section 2 requires legislation raising additional revenue to cover the deficit.

Under section 4 neither the House nor the Senate may adjourn until estimated revenue and enacted appropriations, plus any previous year deficit, are in balance.

The amendment, of course, is careful to provide that it is not applicable during periods when the United States is engaged in war declared by Congress, or in open hostilities against an external enemy.

In simple language, this amendment would prohibit deficit spending; if appropriations exceed revenue, taxes must be raised to cover the deficit. This would be an effective deterrent to nonessential spending, which actually comprises a big part of every deficit.

Practically everything else has been tried to curb excessive spending, of the type born with the New Deal policy of tax, spend, and elect. Maybe a law government wide, prohibiting expenditures beyond income, can do it.